

25976

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,
Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University.

VOL. I.

BALTIMORE: THE EDITOR.
NEW YORK AND LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO.
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
1880.

347 70

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

No. I.

	PAGR.
Editorial Note,	1
I.—Δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων and δίκαι συμβόλαιαι. By W. W. GOODWIN, of Harvard University,	3
II.—Two German Scholars on one of Goethe's Masquerades. By FRANKLIN CARTER, of Yale College,	12
III.—Geddes' Problem of the Homeric Poems. By L. R. PACKARD, of Yale College,	32
IV.—Encroachments of <i>μῆ</i> on <i>οὐ</i> in Later Greek. By the Editor,	45
NOTES:	58
The Dionysion at Marathon. (By THOMAS DAVIDSON.) Il B. 318, 319. (By A. C. MERRIAM.) The word <i>weasand</i> . (By ALBERT S. COOK.) Varia: Korinna, p. 20.—Aristot. Met. A 7 p. 1072, b 2. (Bekk.)— Paus. I 26, 5. (By THOMAS DAVIDSON.)	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	68
Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar—Clough's Hexameter and Latin Rhythms —Vincent and Dickson's Hand-Book to Modern Greek—Wheeler: De Alcestidis et Hippolyti Interpolationibus—Tyler's Lyric Poets— Hewett's Frisian Language.	
REPORTS:	75
Revue de Philologie—Anglia—Revue Archéologique—Hermes—Athénai— Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher—Mnemosyne—Romania.	
LIST OF PERIODICALS,	117
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	119

No. II.

I.—Etymological and Grammatical Notes. By F. D. ALLEN, of Yale College,	127
II.—Recent Investigations of Grimm's Law. By H. C. G. BRANDT, of Johns Hopkins University,	146
III.—Principles of Orthography of French Verbs ending in <i>eler</i> and <i>eter</i> . By B. F. O'CONNOR, of Johns Hopkins University,	161
IV.—Xenophon's <i>Oeconomicus</i> . By C. D. MORRIS, of Johns Hopkins University,	169
V.—The Fourth Play in the Tetralogy. By M. W. HUMPHREYS, of Vanderbilt University,	187
NOTE:	197
The so-called "Subjonctif Dubitatif," <i>Je ne sache pas</i> . By SAMUEL GARNER.	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	203
Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language—Mallery's Sign Language of the North American Indians—Recent American Publications in Romance Philology and Literature.	
REPORTS:	211
Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft—Journal Asiatique—Germania—Englische Studien—Revue de Philologie—Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie—Rheinisches Museum—Philologus.	
LANX SATURA,	241
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	245

No. III.

	PAGE.
I.—Verrius Flaccus I. By H. NETTLESHIP, Corpus Prof. of Latin, Oxford,	253
II.—The History of <i>Coincide</i> and <i>Coincidence</i> . By H. E. SHEPHERD, Baltimore,	271
III.—The 'Ablaut' of Greek Roots which show Variation between E and O. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, of Johns Hopkins University,	281
IV.—Logical Consistency in Views of Language. By W. D. WHITNEY, of Yale College,	327
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	344
Catalogue of the Spanish Library . . . bequeathed by George Ticknor to the Boston Public Library—Recent Publications in the Field of Indian Antiquities—Richard Bentley's <i>Emendationen zum Plautus</i> —Murray's <i>Origin and Growth of the Psalms</i> .	
REPORTS:	361
<i>Mnemosyne</i> — <i>Anglia</i> — <i>Revue de Philologie</i> — <i>Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Paedagogik</i> — <i>Hermes</i> .	
LANX SATURA,	381
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	383

No. IV.

I.—The Neapolitanus of Propertius. By ROBINSON ELLIS, of Trinity College, Oxford,	389
II.—A proposed Redistribution of Parts in the Parodos of the Vespa. By F. G. ALLINSON, of Haverford College,	402
III.—Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in the Roman Folk-Speech. By E. A. FAY, of National Deaf Mute College,	410
IV.—Problems of General Semitic Grammar. By C. H. TOY, of Harvard University,	416
V—Notes on the Agamemnon of Aeschylus. By LEWIS CAMPBELL, of the University of St. Andrews, North Britain,	427
VI.—Keltic and Germanic. By J. M. HART, of the University of Cincinnati,	440
NOTES:	453
Varia. (By M. W. HUMPHREYS.) On <i>πιαπ</i> as an Adjective. (By F. G. ALLINSON.) On <i>Je ne sache pas</i> . (By A. LODEMAN.)	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	463
G. Meyer's <i>Griechische Grammatik</i> —Roby's <i>School Latin Grammar</i> —Butcher and Lang's <i>Odyssey</i> —Merriam's <i>Phaeacians</i> —Heilprin's <i>Historical Poetry of the Hebrews</i> —Dunbar's <i>Concordance to the Odyssey</i> —Braune's <i>Gotische Grammatik</i> —Weinkauff's <i>De Tacito Dialogi auctore</i> —Knapp's <i>Lecturas de clase</i> .	
REPORTS:	476
<i>Mnemosyne</i> — <i>Archaeologische Zeitung</i> — <i>Hermes</i> — <i>Anglia</i> — <i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> —Paul u. Braune's <i>Beiträge</i> — <i>Alemannia</i> — <i>Zeitschrift für Orthographie</i> — <i>Romania</i> .	
NECROLOGY:	511
F. E. Anderson—S. S. Haldeman.	
LANX SATURA,	514
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	516
INDEX,	529

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. I.

No. 1.

EDITORIAL NOTE.

The establishment of some such medium of intercommunication as this journal hopes to become has long been thought desirable by the foremost scholars of the country. The project was mooted several years ago at the meeting of the American Philological Association, held in Easton, and the plan has never been wholly lost sight of by its advocates. More recently, in yet other quarters, an effort has been made to set such a journal on foot, and indications of the ripening purpose have not been wanting in different sections of the Union, so that I was but giving expression to a widespread conviction when I said in my address as President of the Philological Association at its meeting in Saratoga (July, 1878): "It certainly betokens great supineness on the part of our scholars that a country which boasts a *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, should not have even a solitary periodical devoted to a science which counts its professed votaries by hundreds, if not by thousands, and that our professors and teachers should be satisfied with consigning an occasional paper to the slow current of a volume of transactions, or with exposing a stray lucubration to struggle for notice amidst the miscellaneous matter of a review or the odds and ends of an educational magazine." This statement of the need was, however, in no sense an engagement to supply the demand, but when it became apparent that the same liberality which had sustained the American Journal of Mathematics and had aided the American Chemical Journal, would not be wanting to an American Journal of Philology, it seemed a duty to the cause of my department,

as well as a proper recognition of the generous spirit in which the Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University had facilitated my special work, that I should at all events make an earnest effort to carry out the project. But before making any public announcement I consulted some of the leading scholars who represent the various departments of philological study in the great sections of the country, and the answers received were so cordial, the confidence in my plans so flattering, and the pledges of coöperation so satisfactory, that in the latter part of May, 1879, I gave wide circulation to a prospectus, which brought still further assurances of support and a comparatively long list of subscribers, representing most of the institutions of note in thirty States of the Union. Thus encouraged, I made arrangements for the printing of the Journal, and though the appearance of it has been somewhat delayed by the intervention of vacation, which scattered the friends of the enterprise, and then by the opening session, with its arduous labors, which have left some of the prominent contributors little time for the preparation of the articles promised, still the Journal comes out within a reasonable time after the announcement of the project; and while it has not been possible to secure a perfect balance at first, and to some the Greek element may seem suspiciously preponderant, those who know the spirit in which this work has been undertaken will not suspect any undue bias on the part of the editor, and to all others the titles of the reports and the list of periodicals will show that there is an earnest desire to represent as fairly as may be the whole cycle of philological study. A unity of management seemed necessary, in view of the responsibility of the editor to those who made this undertaking possible, but the Journal has been so fortunate as to secure the coöperation of scholars eminent for their attainments in Comparative Grammar, in the Oriental, the Romance and the Teutonic languages, as well as the aid of specialists in Latin and Greek and the general disciplines of classical study; and it is hoped that the different departments will all find their representatives zealously active in the section of original contributions. Reviews of new books will be intrusted to specialists, so far as possible, and the name of the reviewer, except in rare cases, will be given as the guarantee of the thoroughness and honesty of the review. Notices of school-books do not properly fall within the province of this journal, but as a matter of duty to teachers and to the public at large, no hesitation will be felt in giving from time to time such

frank statements as are eminently necessary in the present condition of American criticism.

With the help of the most active and enterprising scholars of America, with a large storehouse of European periodical literature for the quickening and enriching of our own work, with a generous support accorded in advance by the munificence of our new university and by the fraternal spirit of fellow-workers through the length and breadth of the land, the Journal enters upon a career that is full of hope. To be found not wholly unworthy of this trust is henceforth one of the highest aims of my professional life, and it is not unnatural that with this conviction I should again and again invoke the earnest efforts and hearty aid of all the friends of sound learning in America.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

I.—ΔΙΚΑΙΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΣΥΜΒΟΛΩΝ AND ΔΙΚΑΙΑ ΣΥΜΒΟΛΑΙΑΙ.

The words of the Athenian orator in Thucydides, I. 77: *καὶ ἐλασσούμενοι γάρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαίαις πρὸς τὸν ξυμβάχους δίκαιας*, are a familiar puzzle, and any new attempt to discuss them is apt to excite a smile. The opinion of recent editors of Thucydides is nearly or quite unanimous in considering *δίκαια ξυμβόλαια* here the same as *δίκαια ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*. The latter name, which originally meant *treaty-suits* between citizens of different states, tried in the courts of either state according to the provisions of treaties (*σύμβολα*), was (it is affirmed) made to include, by a remarkable “euphemism,” the suits which Athens *compelled* her subject allies to bring in her own courts during the time of her maritime empire. The same view is taken by Curtius¹ and in Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon.² A significant protest, however, was raised against this interpretation by Boeckh and Grote; but their objections have generally been answered by triumphantly quoting Bekker’s Anecdota, p. 436, I: *Αθηναῖοι ἀπὸ συμβόλων ἐδίκαζον τοῖς ὑπηκόοις οὕτως ἀριστοτέλης.*

Three questions must be answered here: First, to what extent were the allies of Athens required to bring their lawsuits to Athens for trial? Secondly, what were the *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*, apart from any supposed allusion to them in Thucydides? Thirdly, are the *ξυμβόλαια δίκαια* of Thucydides identical with the *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*?

I. The jurisdiction of the Athenian courts over the subject allies is fully discussed by Boeckh³ and Grote,⁴ and it is sufficient to refer to them for the ancient authorities on this subject. All are agreed that the tributary subjects of Athens, the *ὑπήκοοι*, *φόρον ὑποτελεῖς*, who were deprived of their military force and often had Athenian troops quartered on them, and were held to their allegiance by the presence of Athenian overseers (*ἐπίσκοποι*) and other officers, were deprived of most of their independent jurisdiction in civil causes and compelled to sue and be sued in the courts of Athens. With

¹ Griech. Gesch. II. p. 184, and p. 691 (note 37).

² s. v. *σύμβολον*.

³ Staatshaushaltung der Athener, I. pp. 528–539 (Book III. § 16): see especially note on pp. 529–531.

⁴ History of Greece, VI. pp. 48–63: for a discussion of Boeckh’s views, see note on pp. 57–59.

regard to the independent allies, the *αὐτόνομοι*, οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς φόροι, the extent of the Athenian jurisdiction is more doubtful, as no ancient writers touch this point. We can assume, at all events, that their obligation to use the Athenian courts was not compulsory, and did not exclude (at least originally) some reciprocity on the part of Athens. This question will be discussed again below (p. 15). So far as this jurisdiction of Athens applied to civil suits between citizens of different states within the alliance, it was hardly a piece of oppression, as it secured an even administration of justice throughout the Athenian dominions. It is in some respects analogous to the necessity by which citizens of different states in the American Union are often compelled to bring suits in United States courts, sometimes even in the Supreme Court at Washington. Nor could it have been thought oppressive that Athens should insist on having all suits between Athenians and citizens of the subject states tried at Athens. The real hardship was felt when the subject allies were obliged to bring to Athens all the civil suits between citizens of the same state, in which neither Athens nor the confederacy as a whole had any direct interest.¹ We do not know how far the jurisdiction of Athens extended; it is absurd to suppose that none was left to the local courts of even the least favored states, although even there Athenian officers may have presided or judged, and it is likely that such courts were limited to cases which involved only small sums of money. As to criminal suits, we have little definite knowledge beyond the fact that sentence of death could be imposed only by an Athenian court or by the authority of Athens (not ἀνευ Ἀθηναίων). The oration of Antiphon *de Caede Herodis* was written for a citizen of Mytilene charged before an Athenian court with the murder of Herodes, who was probably an Athenian, resident as *χληροῦχος* in Mytilene.² The speech says that *even a state* (obviously meaning a state in the position of Mytilene after its revolt in 428 B. C.) *has no power to inflict the death penalty without the authority of Athens.*³ We may infer from the tone of this remark that less important criminal trials were not carried to Athens. One other instance of a public

¹ To this compulsion Xenophon alludes, *De Rep. Ath.* I. 16: τοὺς συμμάχους ἀναγκάζοντι πλεῖν ἐπὶ δίκαιας Ἀθῆνας. So Athenaeus, IX. p. 407 B: καθ' ὃν δὲ χοῖνον θαλασσοκρατοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνῆγον εἰς ἀστυν τὰς νησιωτικὰς δίκαιας.

² Jebb, *Attic Orators*, I. p. 56; Blass, *Attische Beredsamkeit*, I. p. 162.

³ Antiph. *Caed. Herod.* § 47: δοιδὲ πόλεις ἔξεστιν, ἀνευ Ἀθηναίων οιδένα θανάτῳ ζημιῶσαι.

suit brought against a foreigner in an Athenian court is the amusing case of the Thasian writer of parodies or burlesques, Hegemon. Though the offence charged is not mentioned, the use of *γραψάμενος* and *γραφή* shows that it was a public suit. Its importance can be inferred from the story told by Athenaeus, that Hegemon collected a crowd of "theatrical artists" to support him, and implored the help of Alcibiades, who encouraged a literary man in distress by going with the crowd to the record office and rubbing out the entry of the suit with his wetted finger, while the authorities stood by in peaceful amazement and the plaintiff took to his heels.¹ If, as Boeckh² supposes, the case was one of *γραφή ὅβρεως*, this was an *ἄγων τιμητός* and might lead to a capital sentence.³ The suits in which the "island-summoner and sycophant" in Aristophanes proposes to use his wings are plainly civil, not criminal, as appears from the use of *ἔγχεικηχώς*, which like *ἔγχημα* is used chiefly of private prosecutions, and from the plan for seizing the defendant's property when he was defaulted by his tardiness.⁴

II. What now were *δίκαια ἀπὸ σύμβολων*, in the ordinary sense of the expression? *Σύμβολα*, in the only sense admissible here, is thus defined by Harpocration: *σύμβολα, τὰς συνθήκας ἃς ἀν αἱ πόλεις ἀλλήλαις θέμεναι τάττωσι τοῖς πολίταις ὥστε διδόναι ταὶ λαμβάνειν τὰ δίκαια*,⁵ treaties, therefore, which independent states make with each other to define the conditions under which citizens of either may sue or be sued in the courts of the other. The most distinct account of such treaties is given in the oration on Halonnesus, from which it appears that Philip, shortly after the peace of Philocrates (346 B. C.), sent an embassy to Athens to arrange *σύμβολα* between Athens and Macedonia, making the condition, however, that the decisions given under the treaty should not be valid until they had been confirmed by himself, thus (the orator says) making a judicial decision of Athens liable to be carried on appeal to the king of Macedon.⁶ The nature of such treaties appears when the orator speaks of the earlier times, when there was much

¹ Athenaeus, IX. 407 C.

² Staatsh. I. p. 532 (note).

³ Meier and Schömann, Att. Proc. p. 326.

⁴ Aristoph. Av. 1420-1460.

⁵ Harp. s. v. *σύμβολα*. The same definition is found (essentially) in Photius, Suidas, and the Etymologicum Magnum.

⁶ *ταῦτα δὲ κύρια ἔσεσθαι οὐκ ἐπειδὰν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τῷ παρ' ὑμῖν κυρωθῇ, ὡσπερ δὲ νόμος κελεύει, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὰν ὡς ἔαντὸν ἐπανενεχθῇ, ἐφέσιμον τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν γενομένην γνῶσιν εἰς ἔαντὸν ποιόμενος.* [Dem.] Halon. § 9 (p. 79). A defence of the interpretation of these words here given will be found below (pp. 10-12).

greater intercourse between the two countries and less facility for settling disputes, and yet it was not thought profitable to make σύμβολα and for Macedonians to sail to Athens and for Athenians to sail to Macedonia to obtain justice, but Athenians brought suits in Macedonian courts and the Macedonians in Athenian courts in the ordinary way.¹ In Pseudo-Andocides in Alcibiad., § 18, it is said : *πρὸς μὲν τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἐν τοῖς συμβόλοις συντιθέμεθα μὴ ἔξειναι μῆδε εἰρῆσαι μῆτε δῆσαι τὸν ἐλεύθερον*, from which it appears that the σύμβολα might secure the citizens of one state, especially a powerful one like Athens, from certain treatment and special penalties in the courts of the other. Athens would naturally be anxious to protect Athenians from many indignities to which other states subjected their citizens without scruple.²

We find many allusions to a *city of appeal*, πόλις ἔκκλητος, to the courts of which any one who felt himself aggrieved by a judgment in another state could carry his case on appeal. In Bekker's Anecdota we find : *ἔκκλητος πόλις ἐστὶν ἣν ἔκκαλεῖται τις εἰς τὸ χρῖναι αὐτῷ ἀγῶνα τινα, δῆλον δὲ τι φεύγων τὴν πρώτην ὡς πρὸς ἔχθραν ἡ χάριν χρίνουσαν*.³ Pollux mentions under ἔφεσις, *appeal*, one ἀπὸ δικαστῶν ἐπὶ ξενικὸν δικαστήριον.⁴ As we cannot believe that in any suit between two Athenians there was ever an appeal from the Athenian courts to a foreign tribunal of any kind, the words of Pollux are naturally referred to cases in which a foreigner, feeling himself aggrieved by the decision of an Athenian court in the δικαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων, carried his case by appeal to *some* foreign court. This is strongly confirmed by the words in Bekker's Anecdota which follow those just quoted : *ἔξην δὲ τοῖς ξένοις μάλιστα ἔκκαλεῖσθαι, τοῖς δὲ πολίταις ηγιστα*. A more unqualified statement is found in the Etymologicum Magnum : *ἔξην δὲ τοῖς μὲν ξένοις ἔκκαλεῖσθαι πόλιν ἄλλην, τοῖς δὲ πολίταις οὐκέτι*. It would, of course, be chiefly or

¹ ἀλλ' ὅμως, οὐδενὸς τοιωτὸν δυτος, τότε οὐκ ἐλυσιτέλει σύμβολα ποιησαμένους οὐτ' ἐκ Μακεδονίας πλεῖν 'Αθηναῖς δίκαις ληφθομένους οὐθ' ίμιν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, ἀλλ' ήμεις τε τοῖς ἐκείνοις τοῖς παρ' ίμιν τὰς δίκαις ἐλάμβανον. [Dem.] Halon. § 13 (p. 79.)

² With the same object many nations now make treaties with certain states. Thus the United States have a treaty with Japan, providing that the U. S. consular courts in Japan shall have jurisdiction in all offences committed by American citizens against Japanese, while the Japanese courts shall try offences of Japanese against Americans; but allowing Japanese creditors to bring civil suits against Americans in the U. S. consular courts, and American creditors against Japanese in the Japanese courts.

³ I. p. 247, 30. ⁴ Onomasticon, VIII. 62.

only foreigners who would find it for their interest to appeal from an Athenian court to another, either of their own or of some third country; while an Athenian who had been defeated in his own city in a suit with a foreigner would never carry his case elsewhere.

But what are the foreign courts to which a foreigner, thus defeated in an Athenian court in a suit with an Athenian, could carry his case on appeal? It seems to me that they can have been no other than those of a *πόλις ἔχαλητος* which was agreed upon by the two states and appointed in the *σύμβολα* between them. It is generally stated that in the *δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων* an appeal to the courts of his own country was open to every one who was dissatisfied with the judgment of a foreign court—that, for example, a Rhodian in a suit with an Athenian, tried at Athens, could appeal to Rhodes, while an Athenian in a suit with a Rhodian, tried at Rhodes, could appeal to Athens. Meier and Schömann repeat this from Hudtwalcker,¹ and add that “perhaps” also a party defeated in such a suit in his own state could appeal to a court in his opponent’s country.² But what could have been the object of all the machinery of the *σύμβολα*, with their appointment of suits to be tried in either country, and all their necessary detail, if either party at his pleasure could annul the judgment in any suit and carry the case for trial before the courts of his own country? Let us suppose, for example, that an Athenian and a Rhodian have a suit tried in an Athenian court, and judgment is given for the Athenian; is it possible now that the Athenian can have been compelled to submit to a second trial at Rhodes whenever it pleased his adversary to appeal to a “court of his own country”? Still less likely is it that the Athenian, if he was defeated in a contest with a Rhodian in an Athenian court, would value the right to carry his case to a Rhodian court. The common opinion makes a *πόλις ἔχαλητος*, so far as *δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων* are concerned, merely one of the contracting cities to which a case is carried on appeal from the other, each being a *city of appeal* for all suits tried in the other’s courts. It would be difficult, however, to find an instance in which *πόλις ἔχαλητος* is actually so used, or indeed any authentic case in which two independent states exercised the supposed right of mutual appeal. We are sure, however, that *πόλις ἔχαλητος* did sometimes denote a third state appointed as umpire to decide disputes between

¹ Hudtwalcker, *Diaeteten in Athen*, p. 124.

² Meier and Schömann, *Att. Proc.* p. 775.

two states. Plutarch applies this name to Megara when the Athenians appealed to her to settle their disputes with the Spartan king Agesipolis.¹ The custom of referring international disputes to arbitration, so far from being a device of the present age, was almost universal in Greece, at least in theory.² It was, therefore, natural that the Greeks should adopt the same system of reference to an impartial state as umpire, when a court of appeal was needed in the *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*. That they did not adopt the suicidal method of allowing each party to carry his suit by appeal home to his own courts, must be obvious. In a treaty between the Hierapytnii and the Priansii of Crete, probably made in the third century B. C., there is a distinct provision for referring disputes between their respective citizens, when they could not be settled by a tribunal recognized by the treaty, to some city which was to be agreed upon by the contracting states.³ To such a city of appeal all the notices of a *πόλις ἔχκλητος* and of *δίκαια ἔχκλητοι* naturally refer, and in none of them is there the slightest intimation that the appeal is to be made by a citizen to a court of *his own country*.⁴

The passage quoted above from the oration on Halonnesus seems to show that Athens, in the time of Philip, sometimes or always exercised the right of the stronger, and reserved to herself the right of "confirming" all decisions of foreign courts which affected her own citizens. This, however, can hardly have gone further than annulling the foreign judgment and ordering a new trial; it certainly did not constitute a right of *appeal*, in the proper sense of this word. When there was a *πόλις ἔχκλητος*, the *χύρωσις*

¹ Plut. Apophth. Lacon. p. 215: Ἀθηναίων πρὸς αὐτὸν, περὶ ὃν εἰχον πρὸς ἄλληλον ἐγκλημάτων, τὴν τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλιν ἐκκλητον λαμβανόντων.

² See the treaty between Sparta and Argos in Thuc. V. 79: αἱ δέ τις τῶν ἔνυμάχων πόλεις πόλει ἐρίζοι, ἐς πόλειν ἐλθεῖν ἀντεναὶσαν ἀμφοῖν ταῖς πολίεσσι δοκεῖοι. So, in Thuc. I. 28, the Corcyraeans propose to Corinth to refer the question of Epidamnus to any Peloponnesian states which both should agree upon. Such states, as Krüger rightly observes, would be called *πόλεις ἐκκλητοι*.

³ Πόλιν σταντεύειν ἄγ καὶ ἀμφοτέρας ταῖς πόλεσι δόξῃ. See Boeckh's Corpus Inscript. Graec., No. 2556, lines 47-70, with the editor's remarks. At the end of the treaty the words κατὰ τὸ δοχθὲν κοινῷ σύμβολον occur.

⁴ See Hesych. s. ἐκκλητοι δίκαια αἱ ἐπὶ ξένης λεγόμεναι, καὶ οὐκ ἐν τῇ πόλει. Aeschines (in Timarch. § 89) says: εἰ μὲν τοινν ἡ ἀγών οὐτοις ἐν πόλει ἐκκλήτω, meaning simply if this case were on trial in some foreign court, where the parties were unknown to the judges. See the Scholia on this passage, which agree generally with Bekk. Anecd. (I. p. 247, 30) quoted above. See Pollux, VIII. 63: αὐται δὲ καὶ ἐκκλητοι δίκαια ἐκαλοῦντο.

reserved by Athens may have been merely the process by which a judgment could be carried on appeal to the foreign court; when there was no such city, it gave Athens the right of *veto* when she felt that a foreign judgment had done injustice to any of her citizens. The words of the orator (§ 9, quoted p. 9) make it perfectly clear that Philip's claim, whatever it was, was nothing more than what Athens regularly (*ὡσπερ ὁ νόμος κελεύει*) insisted on whenever she made such a treaty. The indignation of the orator at Philip's claim is amusing in this light; but it is entirely inconsistent with the idea that an appeal from one country to the other (involving not merely a veto power, but the right of judging the case anew and finally) was an essential or even a common part of the system of *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*.

I am aware that most modern scholars, following Meier and Schömann's interpretation of *de Halonnese*, § 9, refer the demand of Philip for the right of *κύρωσις* not to a confirmation or even a revision of the judgments rendered by the Athenian courts, but to the ratification of the treaty itself which was to provide for the *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*. They likewise understand the allusion to Athens to imply a similar claim on her part to a final ratification of such treaties.¹ To this ratification on the part of Athens have been referred the words of Pollux, where he says of the Thesmothetae: *καὶ τὰ σύμβολα τὰ πρὸς τὰς πόλεις κυροῦσστιν*, and Meier and Schömann therefore suppose that the treaty itself was referred to a board of Heliastic judges under the presidency of the Thesmothetae for final ratification,² the advantage to Athens being that after this process "the other state could have no power of revision and alteration." But is it to be supposed that the courts of Athens had the right to "revise and alter" a treaty with a foreign state after the other state had ratified it, and that Athens would have ventured to insist on any such right against Philip just after the peace of Philocrates? Or would Philip have dared to set up such a claim against Athens when he was asking her to make a treaty with him? If, on the other hand, only the right of final ratification is meant, with no power of revision, what was the great value of the right to either party, and why should the Athenian orator be so indignant at Philip for claiming it while he admitted that Athens regularly (*ὡσπερ ὁ νόμος κελεύει*) exercised it toward others? Why, above all, should he say that Philip claimed that "a

¹ Att. Proc. p. 776 (note 9). ² Poll. VIII. 63; Att. Proc. p. 775.

judgment of an Athenian court should be carried up to him for appeal"?¹

If it was supposed that Philip would ratify the treaty before it was submitted to the Athenian court, it cannot be meant that he claimed the right to change his mind and withdraw his ratification, which would simply leave things as they were before the treaty was negotiated; if, on the other hand, he was not expected to ratify it previously, it cannot be meant that Athens claimed the right to cut him off from ratifying it before he would be bound by its provisions. In any case, the plot of Philip would have been a harmless one after the Athenian orator had once suspected and announced it.

The right to ratify a treaty last rather than first would not be considered a very valuable one by an honest state, and the demand for such a privilege would be in itself suspicious. But we have abundant knowledge of the manner in which ordinary Greek treaties were ratified, and we see that no such loose system of ratification as we are here considering was customary. The treaty made by Athens in 420 B. C. with Argos, Mantinea, and Elis provided for a ratification by a most solemn prescribed oath on the part of each state, the oath in Athens to be sworn by the whole Senate and the Magistrates, and to be administered by the Prytanes, and all the oaths to be renewed before certain great festivals. The treaty was, moreover, to be set up on stone tablets in each of the four contracting states, and in bronze at Olympia.² The ratification of the peace of Nicias in 421 B. C. was quite as formal.³ The peace of Philocrates in 346 B. C. was not sworn to by Philip until nearly three months after it was ratified at Athens; but this was in consequence of the criminal neglect of the embassy which Athens sent with strict orders to administer the oath to Philip without delay. It seems incredible that a state which was accustomed to such formal ratification of treaties can have deemed the right of ratifying such conventions as these *σύμβολα* last rather than first a matter of any great moment.

All these difficulties vanish when we refer the ratification in question to the judicial decisions given under the treaties, and not to the treaties themselves. We must then understand by *ταῦτα* in

¹ [Dem.] de Halon. § 9: ἐφέσιμον τὴν παρ' ίμῶν γενομένην γνῶσιν ὡς ἔαντὸν ποιούμενος.

² Thuc. V. 47. ³ Thuc. V. 18.

§ 9 of the oration on Halonnesus *the decisions* to be given under the *σύμβολα* which Philip proposed. Philip claimed then the right to revise all judgments given under the proposed *σύμβολα* in the courts of Athens or in his own courts, and to annul any which he thought prejudicial to the rights of his subjects,¹ a right similar to that which Athens herself asserted. That this and no other was the meaning of the orator, is still more plain in what follows, when he gives the reasons why Philip makes the claim in question. When Philip took possession of Potidaea, many Athenian residents of that city lost their property; and Philip (as the orator thought) wanted to be safe against any claims for restitution of such property, which if they were allowed might weaken his title to the place itself. This point Philip expected to secure by retaining a personal right of revision of all suits between Athenians and Macedonians, which he thought would prevent all Athenians from bringing suits relating to Potidaea in any courts. Such a provision as Philip wanted would give him a more direct supervision of *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων* than he could possibly exercise over the local courts in his dominions, in one of which some Athenian might sue for the recovery of his lost estates were it not for the *σύμβολα*. The only other possible explanation of the orator's words, that Philip expected to smuggle some clause into the treaty itself recognizing his title to Potidaea or providing against suits to recover Athenian property there, and to effect this by having *the right to ratify the treaty last*, would seem too unlikely to be noticed if it were not a necessary part of the interpretation which has been discussed.

¹ The interpretation of *ταῦτα* here given is that of Reiske, Jakobs, and others, who are censured for it by Meier and Schömann, Att. Proc. p. 776 (note 9). It is certainly not free from objection, but is the only one possible if we reject that of Meier and Schömann as untenable. This gives the words *γνῶστιν* and *ἔφεσιμον* their proper judicial meaning, which they cannot have in any other way, and also explains the words *ώσπερ ὁ νόμος κελεύει* more naturally. The statement of Pollux (VIII. 63), that the Thesmothetae ratified *σύμβολα*, is obscure. If *σύμβολα* can refer (like *ταῦτα* in the former passage) to decisions given by foreign courts, the passage supplements *ἐπειδὴν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τῷ παρ ὑμῖν κυριαρχῷ* in the oration on Halonnesus, showing that the Thesmothetae had the duty of examining such judgments and bringing before an Athenian court any which they thought required revision. If it must be referred to the treaties themselves, we must understand that the Thesmothetae were charged with laying before the proper authorities for ratification all such *σύμβολα* after they were negotiated. The connection of these words with the following, *καὶ δίκαια τὰς ἀπὸ συμβόλων εἰσάγονται*, i. e. *they have the presidency in the δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*, favors equally either interpretation.

III. Having seen what *δίκαιαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων* were, and that reciprocity between two independent states was their chief characteristic, we must now consider whether the *δίκαιαι συμβόλαιαι* of Thucyd. I. 77 are identical with them. The identity is supposed to be established, first, by the resemblance in the two expressions; secondly and chiefly, by the notice in Bekker's *Anecdota*: *Αθηναῖοι ἀπὸ συμβόλων ἐδίκαιαν τοῖς ὑπηκόσις· οὕτως Ἀριστοτέλης.*¹ Aristotle being thus made authority for calling the suits which Athens compelled her subjects to bring in her own courts *δίκαιαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων*, and the *δίκαιαι συμβόλαιαι* of Thucydides being at least a part of these very suits, the argument seems at first conclusive. Unfortunately, we do not have the precise words of Aristotle, and especially we do not know whether he used the word *ὑπηκόσις*. Pollux, who used Aristotle's work on the Constitution of Athens, is more likely to give his opinion when he says: *ἀπὸ συμβόλων δὲ, ὅτε οἱ σύμμαχοι ἐδίκαιαντο.*² If Aristotle used *σύμμαχοι*, the expression might be applied to the members of the second Athenian alliance,³ the one with which Aristotle was personally familiar; but he cannot have spoken of these as *ὑπήκοοι*. He may, however, have included under the general name *ὑπήκοοι* the whole body of allies and subjects who acknowledged the supremacy of imperial Athens in the time of Pericles. In the brief enumeration of these in Thucyd. II. 9, some of the most important states in the Athenian *ξυμμαχία* are not tributaries, but independent allies. Such are the Chians, Lesbians, Plataeans, and Messenians of Napactus, who are elsewhere described as *οἱ ἀπὸ ξυμμαχίας ἀντόνομοι*, as opposed to *ὑπήκοοι* and *φόρου ὑποτελεῖς*.⁴ With all these Athens might naturally have had *σύμβολα*, providing for more or less reciprocity, and to these the notices of the Grammarians may have referred. Before the greater part of the original members of the Delian confederacy had become subjects, the *δίκαιαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων* would have had a wider range. Before 440 B. C., they would have included Samos; and before the secession of Naxos, in 466 B. C. (or earlier), they may have extended to most of the maritime cities of the Aegean.⁵ It would have been a very different thing if the use of the same

¹ Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 436, I. Hesychius, I. p. 489, has the same notice, without mentioning Aristotle.

² Poll. VIII. 63. ³ This is Grote's opinion: *Hist. of Greece*, VI. p. 59.

⁴ Thuc. VII. 57. See Boeckh, *Staatsh.* I. pp. 528-539 (Book III. § 16).

⁵ In Aesch. *Suppl.* 701 we have perhaps the oldest allusion to such suits: *ξένοισι τ' εὐξυμβόλονς, πρὸν ἔξοπλίζεν Ἀρη, δίκαιας ἀτερ πημάτων διδοίεν.*

name had been continued when the reciprocity which was the essential feature of the suits was forcibly removed and the whole relation was one-sided and compulsory; and it is hard to believe that Aristotle, even if he used the word *δικήσοι* at all, meant to include this compulsory jurisdiction of the Athenian courts in his remark. If there was any such expression used in Athens, surely the sarcasm of the name would have been too strong for what Curtius calls its "euphemism."

One of the strongest proofs that there was no such usage is found in Antiphon *de Caede Herodis*, where the speaker says that his father, though preferring to live in Thrace, has not expatriated himself from Mytilene, like some who go and dwell on the mainland among the enemies of Athens, and *bring δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων against Athenians*.¹ This last clause must mean that migrating from Lesbos, and living in a state not bound to Athens by any such close ties as those which the speaker (in his trying circumstances) wishes to represent as existing between conquered Mytilene and Athens, gave men in some way a power to bring *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων* which they did not have in Mytilene. It seems incredible that this can have been spoken in a suit which was itself classed with the *δίκαια ἀπὸ συμβόλων*.

But, it will be said, Thucydides confirms the common opinion by calling the suits of the allies tried at Athens, in spite of their compulsory nature, *δίκαια ξυμβόλαια*. Is then this expression equivalent to *δίκαια ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*? Or are *δίκαια ξυμβόλαια* what the form seems to imply, *δίκαια relating to ξυμβόλαια, suits relating to contracts or business suits*? The latter is the opinion of both Boeckh and Grote; but the resemblance in form between *ξυμβόλαια* and *ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* has carried almost all modern scholars to the other side. There are, however, two passages in Aristotle's *Politics*, never yet brought into this discussion, so far as I know, which seem to me to settle the meaning of *δίκαια ξυμβόλαια* in Thucydides and entirely to destroy the presumption created by the resemblance of the expression to *δίκαια ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*. In *Pol. III. 1, 10*, Aristotle speaks of certain states in which the administration of justice is divided among different magistrates, "as in Sparta different Ephors judge in different kinds of business suits", which he calls *τὰς τῶν*

¹ ὥσπερ ἐτέρους ὅρῳ τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὴν ἡγεμόνην ιόντας καὶ οἰκοῦντας ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις τοῖς ἴμετέροις, καὶ δίκαιας ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων ἴμιν δικαζομένους. § 78. See Boeckh, *Staatsch.* I. p. 530 (note): see also Boeckh's remarks on the following words: *οὐδὲ φείγων τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ἴμετερον*. There is nothing in *πολεμίοις* implying a state of active hostility to Athens, or anything inconsistent with the existence of *σύμβολα*.

συμβολαίων (sc. δίκαιαι).¹ In Pol. II. 5, 11, where he is speaking of suits which arise from the unequal distribution of property, he says: ἀλέγω δὲ δίκαιας τε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ συμβολαίων καὶ φευδομαρτυριῶν κρίσεις καὶ πλουσίων κολαχείας. There is not the smallest doubt that *αἱ τῶν συμβολαίων δίκαιαι* and *δίκαιαι περὶ συμβολαίων* here both refer to suits between citizens of the same state relating to contracts, including probably most civil suits about property or business.² The former passage is in the same chapter with a distinct reference to δίκαιαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων, in which Aristotle says that the right to sue and to be sued does not constitute citizenship, for if it did it would give citizenship to *those who have this right by treaty*.³ This shows Aristotle's clear distinction between δίκαιαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων, *treaty-suits*, by which foreigners gain access to the courts of a state by special treaty, and *αἱ τῶν συμβολαίων δίκαιαι*, *business suits*, which may be between citizens of the same state (as, in the case above mentioned, between Spartans), or, like any other suits, between citizens of different states which use each other's courts. These passages may fairly be cited to offset the reference to Aristotle made by the unknown grammarian in Bekker's *Anecdota*. It seems to me that there can no longer be any doubt that *αἱ ξυμβόλαιαι δίκαιαι* in Thucydides means the same as *αἱ τῶν συμβολαίων δίκαιαι* in Aristotle, and refers to the whole mass of *business suits*—either between two citizens of the same subject state, or between citizens of different subject states, or between an Athenian and a citizen of a subject state—which were tried in the Athenian courts in the time of which the orator is speaking (432 B. C.).

To understand fully the passage of Thucydides,⁴ we must take it in connection with what precedes and what follows. The Athenian

¹ καὶ τὰς δίκαιας δικάζονται κατὰ μέρος, οἷον ἐν Δακεδαίμονι τὰς τῶν συμβολαίων δικάζει τῶν ἔφρων ἄλλος ἄλλας.

² Susemihl translates τὰς τῶν συμβολαίων in Pol. III. 1, 10, "Civilsachen." Shilleto (note on Thuc. I. 77) asks: "Are not all δίκαιαι 'κατὰ ξυμβόλαια'?" In Demosth. in Zenoth. § 1 (p. 882, 5) we find: οἱ νόμοι κελεύονται τὰς δίκαιας εἶναι τοῖς ναυκλήροις καὶ τοῖς ἐμπόροις τῶν Ἀθηναῖς καὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῆντος συμβολαίων, i. e., *suits relating to money lent on goods to be taken from Athens or brought to Athens*, in which a certain class of δίκαιαι συμβολαίων is mentioned. See Meier and Schömann, Att. Proc. p. 539, 540.

³ Arist. Polit. III. 1, 4: οὐδὲ οἱ τῶν δικαίων μετέχοντες οὐτως ὥστε καὶ δίκαιην ἀπέχειν καὶ δικάζεσθαι τοῦτο γάρ ἵπάρχει καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ συμβόλων κοινωνοῦσιν.

⁴ Thucyd. I. 76, 77: ἄλλον γ' ἀν οὖν οἰδεθεα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντας δεῖξαι ἀν μάλιστα εἰ τι μετριάζομεν ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ἀδοξία τὸ πλέον ἡ ἐπανος οὐκ εἰκότως περιέστη. καὶ ἐλασσούμενοι γάρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαίαις πρὸς τοὺς ξυμβάχοντας δίκαιας, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς δροῖς νόμοις ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις, φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν.

orator at Sparta has been praising the moderation of his country in her dealings with her subject allies, a moderation which (he says) has brought her more reproach than credit. "For even when we put ourselves at a disadvantage in business suits with our allies, and have such cases tried in our own courts under the same laws to which we ourselves are subject, we are thought to be fond of litigation." The orator mentions only business suits, partly because it was felt to be the greatest hardship to bring these suits to Athens, since both parties (if they were not Athenians) were compelled to take an expensive journey and often to be absent from home a long time; while it is unlikely (as has been shown above) that any criminal suits except the more important were carried from the subject states to the Athenian courts, and in these it was probably a matter of indifference to the accused where he was tried, as he had no expenses. But the chief reason for referring to civil suits with special emphasis is to be seen in *φιλοδικεῖν*. The charge of *loving litigation* was based chiefly on the profits which Athens received from having the civil suits of the allies tried in her courts; and Xenophon, who states the case with his usual severity against Athens, alludes only to these. He mentions first the court fees or *πρυτανεῖα*, which with rare exceptions were paid only in civil suits, but in these were paid for both plaintiff and defendant; secondly, the opportunities for protecting the friends of democracy and plundering aristocrats; then the gain in the customs duties, the profits of lodging-house keepers, of stable keepers, etc.¹ Of course the object of the orator in Thucydides is to represent Athens as rather a martyr to her sense of justice than an oppressor. He therefore refers especially to civil suits between Athenians and citizens of subject states, and speaks of the Athenians as "putting themselves at a disadvantage" by allowing such cases to be fairly tried by Athenian laws, thus often exposing themselves to danger of losing their suits, whereas, instead of running this risk for the sake of doing impartial justice, they might settle such cases through Athenian governors without judge or jury. He implies that Sparta would have solved the problem in a much simpler way, and much less to the satisfaction of the allies, and says: *καὶ οὐδεὶς σκοπεῖ αὐτῶν, τοῖς καὶ ἄλλοθι που ἀρχὴν ἔχουσι καὶ ἡσσον ἡμῶν πρὸς τοὺς ὑπηρέους μετρίοις οὖσι, διότι τοῦτο οὐκ ὀνειδίζεται· βιάζεσθαι γάρ οἵς ἀν ἐξῆ, δικάζεσθαι οὐδὲν προσδέονται.*

¹ See the whole passage in Xen. *de Repub. Athen.* I. 16-18.

II.—TWO GERMAN SCHOLARS ON ONE OF GOETHE'S MASQUERADES.

Goethes "Jahrmarktsfest zu Plundersweilern," von W. WILMANNS, Ein Abdruck aus dem XLII Bande der Preussischen Jahrbücher. Berlin: G. Reimer.

"Jahrmarktsfest zu Plundersweilern," Ein Capitel in "Aus Goethes Frühzeit," von WILHELM SCHERER. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. 1879.

By the publication of the three volumes, entitled "Der junge Goethe," in 1875, the study of Goethe's youth was greatly quickened. What was before accessible to but few in the manuscripts and documents of Hirzel was laid open to all the admirers of Goethe. It became even more clear then what a period of luxurious growth and blossoming his youth was, and through how great and how many changes some of his more perfect poems and even larger works had passed. Precious letters, clearing up doubtful relations, are in the collection and his first contributions to the journals of his time. Through the aid of these volumes the "poetry and truth" of his Autobiography have become more clearly distinguished. It may be doubted if from the youth of any other great poet we have such an abundance of productions. But if these books made an epoch in Goethe-study, they are so rich in materials that much in them needs further explanation and elucidation.

Among the dramas in the third volume is "Das Jahrmarktsfest zu Plundersweilern," a masquerade, which appears in the ordinary editions of Goethe's works in an enlarged and quite different form, though the Hempel edition presents the original version. Goethe's own mention of this piece in the "Wahrheit und Dichtung" gives it a peculiar interest. He has been speaking of the effects of the "Werther" in bringing him into publicity and causing him to become a lion to the detriment of the quiet composition that he had hoped to carry on. He proceeds: "Yet more than by all the distractions of the day, the author was kept from the elaboration and completion of greater works by the taste then prevalent in this society for *dramatizing* everything of importance which occurred in actual life. What that technical expression (for such it was in our inventive society) really meant shall here be

explained. Excited by intellectual meetings on days of hilarity, we were accustomed in short extemporary performances to communicate in fragments all the materials we had collected toward the formation of larger compositions. One single, simple incident, a pleasantly naïve or even silly word, a blunder, a paradox, a clever remark, personal irregularities or habits, nay, a peculiar expression and whatever else would occur in a gay and bustling life, took the form of a dialogue, a catechism, a passing scene or a drama—often in prose, but oftener in verse.

"By this practice, carried on with genial passion, the really poetic mode of thought was established. We allowed objects, events, persons to stand for themselves in all their bearings, our only endeavor being to comprehend them clearly and exhibit them vividly. Every expression of approbation or disapprobation was to pass in living forms before the eyes of the spectator. These productions might be called animated epigrams, which, though without edges or points, were richly furnished with marked and striking features. The 'Jahrmarktsfest' (Fair-festival) is an epigram of this kind, or rather a collection of epigrams. All the characters there introduced are meant for actual, living members of that society, or for persons at least connected and in some degree known to it; but the meaning of the riddle remained concealed to the greater part; all laughed and few knew that their own marked peculiarities served as the jest."¹

"Die Pasquinaden die er gemacht hat," writes Merck of Goethe to Nicolai in 1774, "sind aus unserem Cirkel in Darmstadt und alle Personen sind Gottlob so unberühmt und unbedeutend dass sie niemand erkennen würde."²

It has long been supposed that Leuchsenring was the Mordecai of this play. But the other characters had not been deciphered until Wilmanns in Vol. XLII of the "Preussische Jahrbücher" made the successful attempt to ascertain the originals for some of the other parts. This year (1879) Scherer, in the volume "Aus Goethes Frühzeit," has published an essay containing his views on the piece. He takes the work of Wilmanns for a foundation, and while in some cases he approves and extends Wilmanns' views, in other matters he quite disagrees with his predecessor. By the light of these two essays what was before an amusing and clever farce becomes

¹ Goethe's Autobiography, Oxenford's translation, Vol. I, pp. 517, 518.

² Zimmermann's Merck, p. 33.

highly ingenious and furnishes instruction not merely in regard to the action of Goethe's prolific mind, but also in regard to his real opinion of some of the *littérateurs* by whom he was surrounded.

But the essays are further valuable as illustrating the work of two of Germany's greatest scholars. Both gentlemen are professors of Germanic studies. Scherer is characterized by an almost exhaustless knowledge of details, whether in grammar, dialects, ancient languages or literary history. He is, moreover, brilliant and suggestive, and certain performances of his, like that on "Lautverschiebung" in his "Geschichte der deutschen Sprache," are bewildering to an ordinary mind. Wilmanns is soberer in movement, though very bold in conception, and a scholar of consummate sagacity. If not equal to Scherer in the knowledge of details, the unity with which he makes all the known phenomena march according to his conception, and converge to a single end, elicits even from his adversaries admiration and applause. His work on the "Gudrun," published in 1874, was a masterpiece of literary constructive ability. His book on the "Nibelungenlied," published in 1876, is still furnishing food for the digestion of the Unitarians, as late numbers of the "Germania" attest. These two scholars belong to the same school. They are followers of Lachmann, though not blindly devoted to his tenets, as were two or three of his earlier adherents. Like Lachmann, they unite the love of letters with the analysis of words. As Lachmann, who won his earliest laurels in the study of Propertius, put his countrymen under lasting obligations by his faithful edition of Lessing, these scholars do not pursue exclusively the studies of ancient or mediæval grammar and rhythm, but contribute of their time and gifts to the elucidation of the masters of modern German. Independently, then, of that interest that attaches to every work of Goethe's youth, the opinions of these eminent scholars with regard to the allusions in this farce to the better known persons in the Darmstadt circle may have value for American students of Goethe.

It became known soon after the publication of "Pater Brey," that Goethe's intention in that piece was to satirize Leuchsenring in the character bearing the title of the play; in fact, the explanation of the piece in "Wahrheit und Dichtung" would at least suggest Leuchsenring as "the tender and soft specimen" aimed at. Now it is by a comparison of the part of Mordecai in the "Jahrmarktfest" with the words of Pater Brey that the identity of these two characters becomes sure. I quote here the tragedy which forms,

as it were, the heart of the "Jahrmarktfest," and, as will later appear, contains a main part of the satire, if we may believe the letter of Caroline Flachsland, written in April, 1773, which says "that Goethe has recently sent hither a fair in verses to pay court to Herr Merck and exhibit in it Leuchsenring's character."

ACT I.

(Der Vorhang hebt sich. Man sieht den Galgen in der Ferne.)

KAISER AHASVERUS. HAMAN.

HAMAN.

Gnädger König Herr und Fürst,
 Du mir es nicht verargen wirst,
 Wenn ich an deinem Geburtstag
 Dir beschwerlich bin mit Verdruss und Klag.
 5 Es will mir aber das Herz abfressen,
 Kann weder schlafen, noch trinken, noch essen.
 Du weist, wie viel es uns Mühe gemacht,
 Bis wir es haben so weit gebracht,
 An Herrn Christum nicht zu glauben mehr.
 10 Wie's that das grosse Pöbelheer;
 Wir haben endlich erfunden klug,
 Die Bibel sey ein schlechtes Buch,
 Und sey im Grund nicht mehr daran
 Als an den Kindern Haimon.
 15 Darob wir denn nun jubiliren
 Und herzliches Mitleiden spüren
 Mit dem armen Schelmenhaufen,
 Die noch zu unserm Herrgott laufen.
 Aber wir wollen sie bald belehren
 20 Und zum Unglauben sie bekehren
 Und lassen sie sich 'wa nicht weisen
 So sollen sie alle Teufel zerreissen.

AHASVERUS.

In so fern ist mirs einerley,
 Doch brauchts all, dünkt mich, nicht's Geschrey.
 25 Lasst sie am Sonnenlicht sich vergnügen,
 Fleissig bei ihren Weibern liegen,
 Damit wir tapfere Kinder kriegen.

HAMAN.

Behüte Gott, Ihre Majestät,
 Das leidt sein Lebtag kein Prophet.

30 Doch wären die noch zu bekehren.
 Aber die leidigen Irrlehren,
 Der Empfindsamen aus Judæa
 Sind mir zum theuren Aerger da.
 Was hilfts, dass wir Religion
 35 Gestossen vom Tyrannenthron,
 Wenn die Kerls ihren neuen Götzen
 Oben auf die Trümmer setzen.
 Religion, Empfindsamkeit;
 's ein Dreck, ist lang wie breit.
 40 Müssen das all exterminiren;
 Nur die Vernunft, die soll uns führen.
 Ihr himmlisch klares Angesicht,

AHASVERUS.

Hat auch dafür keine Waden nicht.
 Wollen's ein andermal besehen.
 45 Beliebt mir jetzt zu Bett zu gehen.

HAMAN.

Wünsch Euro Majestät geruhige Nacht.

ACT II.

DIE KÖNIGINN ESTHER. MARDOCHAI.

ESTHER.

Ich bitt euch, lasst mich ungeplagt.

MARDOCHAI.

Hätt's gern zum letztenmal gesagt;
 Wem aber am Herzen thut liegen,
 50 Die Menschen in einander zu fügen
 Wie Krebs und Kalbfleisch in ein Ragu
 Und eine wohlschmeckende Sauce dazu,
 Kann unmöglich gleichgültig seyn
 Zu sehen, die Heiden wie die Schwein
 55 Und unser Lämmelein Häuflein zart
 Durcheinander lauffen nach ihrer Art.
 Möcht' all sie gern modifiziren,
 Die Schwein zu Lämmern recktfizieren
 Und ein ganzes draus combiniren,
 60 Dass die Gemeine zu Corinthus
 Und Rom, Coloss und Ephesus
 Und Herrenhut und Herrenhag
 Davor bestünde mit Schand und Schmach.
 Da ist es nun an dir, o Frau,

65 Dich zu machen an die Königssau,
 Und seiner Borsten harten Straus
 Zu kehren in Lämmleins Wolle kraus.
 Ich geh aber im Land auf und nieder,
 Caper' immer neue Schwestern und Brüder,
 70 Und gläubige sie alle zusammen
 Mit Hämmleins Lämmleins Liebesflammen.
 Geh dann davon in stiller Nacht,
 Als hätt ich in das Bett gemacht.
 Die Mägdelein haben mir immer Dank ;
 75 Ists nicht Geruch, so ists Gestank.

ESTHER.

Mein Gemahl ist wohl schon eingeschlaffen ;
 Läg lieber mit einem von euren Schaafen.
 Indessen, kann's nicht anders seyn
 Ist's nicht ein Schaaf, so ist's ein Schwein.

With verses 57 ff. in this tragedy Wilmanns compares the following lines from "Pater Brey:"

"Da muss alles calculirt sein,
 Da darf kein einzig Geschöpf hinein ;
 Mäus' und Ratten, Flöh und Wanzen
 Müssen alle beytragen zum Ganzen."

Both passages reveal the same "well-arranged plan for the improvement of the world." The use, too, of the word "Schwein" by both characters to denominate the *ignobile vulgus* who had not yet come into the alliance of enlightening sentimentalism is noteworthy, and points directly to the same person. By Mordecai there can be no doubt that Leuchsenring is represented. In attempting to decipher the other characters the question arises, what is the meaning of this little burlesque tragedy? It seems to be that, in spite of the rationalizing zeal of the men of intellect and the vast projects for amelioration devised by the men of sentiment, the world will go on in its old way. But who are the characters thus united and what are their affinities?

There are two groups, each composed of two persons, introduced as biblical characters, the monarch Ahasuerus and his minister Haman; the queen Esther and the rescuing Mordecai. The biblical issue is certainly wanting, but some sort of biblical affinity in the grouping and relations must be looked for.

To understand clearly the affinities, we must first answer the question, who was Leuchsenring. Besides what can be found in regard to him in the early part of the thirteenth book of "Wahrheit und Dichtung," it may be stated that he belonged to the Darmstadt circle, had travelled with members of the princely family, was a man of some medical knowledge and extensive acquaintance with literary people, who had everywhere, particularly by his influence with women, come to be of considerable importance. A quotation from a letter of Fritz Jacobi to his friend Garve, written in 1786, but describing Leuchsenring as he was eighteen years before, may be introduced here as throwing fuller light on his mind and projects. "At that time," viz., in 1768, writes Jacobi, "he wished to establish a secret order of sensibility, lived and moved in correspondences, and was always loaded with letter-cases from which he read aloud. . . . To transform an entire quarter of the globe appeared to him a trifle, if he could find a hearing with some one or other, or even only possessed money enough, or could get it as a loan. Can anything be more comprehensible than the hypothesis of secret Jesuitism in the head of such a whimsical creature with the liveliest conviction that he was not mistaken in his conjectures? But can, on the other hand, anything be more laughable than the cry of universal, pressing danger at the word of such a being?" It almost seems as if Jacobi had in mind, when writing this letter, not his own personal recollections of Leuchsenring, but the words which Goethe assigns the Hauptmann in regard to him in "Pater Brey":

Er denkt er trägt die welt auf'm Rücken.
Fäng' er uns nur einweil die Mücken!

At all events, with the character which this letter describes, the ideas of Mordecai in the tragedy perfectly correspond.

It is clear that some sort of an antagonism must and does exist between Mordecai and Haman. If the former would establish a new sect, vast and universal, the latter would destroy all sects and introduce a reign of reason, and apparently the very "Empfindung" on which Mordecai would found a new order is the "new idol" that Haman would dethrone. As Leuchsenring is represented in "Wahrheit und Dichtung" in the passage already alluded to as opposed and exposed in his pretentious vanity by Merck, and as it is known from contemporary letters that hostility existed between the two men from about that time, Wilmanns conjectures that the

situation in the tragedy depicts the relations of the parties at the house of the La Roches during Goethe's visit there just after leaving Wetzlar, which visit is described in the above-mentioned passage of the Autobiography.

In other words, La Roche is Ahasuerus, Haman is Merck, Esther is Frau von La Roche. In the passage it is expressly related that after Merck arrived at Ehrenbreitstein, whither Goethe had preceded him, new affinities arose; "for while the two ladies approached each other, Merck had come into closer contact with Herr von La Roche. . . . The daughters, of whom the eldest soon particularly attracted me, fell to my share."

Here we have the group of the first part of the tragedy, Haman-Merck and Ahasuerus-La Roche. But where is Leuchsenring? It can hardly be doubted where, as he uniformly followed the ladies. He is so represented in "Pater Brey," and the hostess is in the tragedy represented by Esther according to Wilmanns' view. Why he selects her for Esther rather than Frau Merck rests perhaps primarily on his conception of Ahasuerus. But Frau von La Roche showed herself keenly "empfindsam" in her novels, especially in her renowned story, "Fräulein von Sternheim," whose history is that of Frau von La Roche herself.¹ Frau von La Roche and Leuchsenring seem thus to belong together, and though Esther neither falls in with Mordecai's plan nor Ahasuerus with that of Haman, there is an affinity indicated by the grouping. That Leuchsenring and Frau Merck were ardent friends might be adduced as a reason for regarding Esther as Frau Merck, if any valid reason existed for excluding Frau von La Roche from a leading part. On the contrary it would seem singular, if the Ehrenbreitstein relations at the time of that visit underlie the tragedy, that Herr von La Roche should be a character, and Frau von La Roche omitted. The biblical affinities are thus maintained, and although the shafts aimed at both Haman and Mordecai are coarse in words, the satire is subtle and, as far as Mordecai is concerned, very sharp. It ought to be noted that it was Merck's influence that changed Goethe's feeling toward Leuchsenring. Up to this visit at Ehrenbreitstein in 1772, he had been entertained by Leuchsenring and cherished a certain respect for him. Here in the masquerade Goethe makes free with Merck, according to Wilmanns, and satirizes his rationalizing zeal, but it is not hard to see that the

¹ Goethe's words on that book may be here quoted: "Alle die Herren irren sich, wenn sie glauben, sie beurtheilen ein Buch—es ist eine Menschenseele."

piece might in a certain sense, in view of the sharper satire of Leuchsenring, be said to "pay court to Merck." This expression from Caroline Flachsland in regard to the play is unintelligible to Wilmanns, while Scherer explains it by supposing that Ahasuerus represents Merck, and that the work was sent to Darmstadt (the tragedy signalizes Ahasuerus' birthday) as a birthday compliment to Merck. It was sent in, or just before, April, 1773, and Merck's birthday is said to have been early in this month.

Scherer's reasoning for reversing the parts in the first act of the tragedy is as follows: In the first place he mentions Wilmanns' quotation from Goethe in regard to Herr von La Roche's "unversöhnlichen Hass gegen das Pfaffenthum." He had published some vigorous letters in regard to monachism. "Is not Haman's part involving a hatred of priesthood more in accordance with La Roche's than Merck's notions?" Scherer would seem to ask.

In the second place he asks, "Where does Wilmanns find proof for the proselytizing rationalism of Merck?" The entire issue of the "Frankfurter Gelehrten Anzeigen," for 1772, when Merck edited it, protests against such rationalism, and Herder pays Merck's own contributions the compliment that "he was always in them Socrates-Addison." As a proof of the freedom of the journal under Merck's editorship from rationalizing tendencies, Scherer cites a review of Damm's "Vom historischen Glauben." This was a decidedly rationalizing book. The author puts the divine authority of the Bible under the critical examination of the sound reason, and says, "one can never appeal to the Bible in defiance of the sound reason; the sound reason is rather the judge in regard to those human writings." Scherer quotes the following interesting passage from the criticism of the book: "Welchen Namen soll man diesem menschenfeindlichen Eifer gehen? Sie¹ sehen bey Brahmanen, Schamanen, Gebern, und Sinesen überall die Fäden der Wahrheit durch die sonderbare Textur ihrer Religion durchziehen und nur bei uns erkennen sie sie nicht in dem Vorhang des Allerheiligsten. Sie sagen und beweisen uns, dass dieser Baum des Erkenntnisses durch so mancherlei Jahrhunderte und Sekten und Dogmen und Concilien habe müssen verschnitten, angebunden, ausgeputzt, gezogen, genährt und gepflegt werden, bis er in dieser Gestalt erschienen sei. Und ist er nun auf einmal so alt oder hat er nicht vielmehr jetzo das Alter, das er nach so vielen Verändernugen haben müsste und sollte?

¹ Such as the author.

... Wer seine Brüder liebt und den Lauf der Welt ein wenig kennt, der wird fühlen dass man mehr zum Wohl des Ganzen beiträgt wenn man sein eigen Feld im Frieden baut, ohne Projecte fürs allgemeine Wohl zu machen, und in allem Jahreszeit und Witterung abwartet." Not a very religious protest one might say. Simply "let well enough alone," something like "das ewige gelten lassen, das leben und leben lassen," which, in Goethe's character, was to Merck "an abomination." But between this passage and Ahasuerus' utterances in the tragedy there is certainly a closer affinity than between this and Haman's intolerant rationalism. And without doubt one must admit Scherer's implication that the sentiments of Merck's editing are fairly represented by this passage. But how can one account for a remark in a letter¹ of Sophie La Roche to Merck that "he ought not to have suffered that in the very first leaves of the journal nuns and priests should be attacked; it had offended some persons"? Possibly the two views are to be reconciled by assuming that at first Merck gave his own ideas freer rein, and learned by experience that a more careful regard for existing institutions, religious and other, would conduce to the prosperity of the journal. The newspaper editor wanted even then, first and foremost, circulation. Merck was a business man, and it is not very averse to the traditional opinion in regard to him to suppose that on more than one occasion, when sending copy to his printers, he may have thrust his tongue into his cheek.

It is fairly legitimate for one who holds firmly to the hypothesis that more of Merck than of any other person underlies the Mephistopheles in "Faust," to adduce here, as confirmatory of the view that Wilmanns advances in regard to Merck's rationalism, the rage and jests of Mephistopheles over the rapacity of the church, as he walks with Faust, after Margaret's mother has handed to the priest the first jewelry supplied by the tempter.

It is not improbable that these humorous but profound words,

Die Kirche hat einen guten Magen,
Hat ganze Länder aufgefressen;
Und doch noch nie sich übergesessen;
Die Kirch' allein, meine lieben Frauen,
Kann ungerechtes Gut verdauen,

were suggested by some bitter sarcasm from Merck himself.

¹ This remark is quoted in Zimmermann's Merck, p. 133, from the first collection of Merck's Letters, Darmstadt, 1835. I have verified the quotation.

The more closely the relations in the tragedy are assumed to answer to the little comedy at Ehrenbreitstein, which, after Merck's arrival, was soon played out, the more natural would seem to be a direct antagonism between Mordecai and Haman. As it was Merck who really opened Goethe's eyes to the character of this sentimental adventurer, and as between Merck and Leuchsenring the antagonism was most decided and became permanent, the Ehrenbreitstein relations seem to answer to Wilmanns' argument. The words of Haman,

Aber die leidigen Irrlehren,
Der Empfindsamen aus Judæa
Sind mir zum theuren Aerger da.
Was hilfts, dass wir Religion
Gestossen vom Tyrannenthron,
Wenn die Kerls ihren neuen Götzen
Oben auf die Trümmer setzen.
Religion, Empfindsamkeit;
's ein Dreck, ist lang wie breit.
Müssen das all exterminiren;

refer, as has been said, to the new order of the "Empfindsamkeit" that Leuchsenring proposed to establish. La Roche, to be sure, laughed at the letters of the fraternity that the founder drew forth from his exhaustless treasury, but Merck regarded them and their porter as detestable. It is an ingenious suggestion by Wilmanns that the concluding words of Mordecai that "the girls will thank him for it," may be an allusion to a sudden departure by Leuchsenring from the house of the La Roches, and that they thank him for withdrawing and thus putting an end to a quarrel.

The reference of Esther to Frau Merck which naturally follows Scherer's view of Ahasuerus, seems to violate the propriety of the situation. Apart from the culture and elegance of Frau von La Roche, of which contemporaneous letters are full, and which would adapt her for the rôle that one would expect from Esther (in regard to Frau Merck comparatively little is known, and that little gives a painful impression of the domestic relations of the Mercks), might not the host and hostess fitly have the places which in the tragedy Wilmanns assigns them? It would seem that the inference should be back from Esther's prototype to that of Ahasuerus, rather than forward to her from him, as Frau von La Roche is too important a figure in the circle not to receive a rôle in some way significant.

On a point of such nicety, where two eminent scholars disagree, it may not be safe to have an opinion. If the preference here seems to be with Wilmanns in the exposition of the tragedy, there are undoubtedly points in the analysis of other parts of the play where Scherer's knowledge of details has helped him to a nicer exactness. Few readers would need to wait for Scherer's minute unfolding of obscure personal relations in order to agree to his objection to the repeated assignment of several characters in the masquerade to one person. It is barely possible that Goethe himself should be represented, not merely by the Doctor, but also by the Tyroler, the Nürnberger and the Zigeunerbursch, though he is undoubtedly behind the latter. It is not probable that Christian Heinrich Schmid, whose acquaintance Goethe made in 1772, as is deliciously described in the latter part of the twelfth book of the *Autobiography*, is behind any other character than the Marktschreyer, whose deference for Doctor-Goethe aptly represents the parasitic character of Schmid's relation to German literature. This sagacious explanation by Wilmanns of the Marktschreyer is approved by Scherer, as is also the reference of the Zigeunerhauptmann to Herder.

To ascertain the resultant of the various influences which Herder exercised upon Goethe is one of the most difficult puzzles in connection with this many-sided man. But in the piece before us the testimony is pretty clear. The main passage from the masquerade is the conversation between the Zigeunerhauptmann and the Zigeunerbursch :

ZIGEUNERHAUPTMANN.

Lumpen und Quark
Der ganze Mark.

ZIGEUNERBURSCH.

Die Pistolen
Möcht ich mir holen.

ZIGEUNERHAUPTMANN.

Sind nicht den Teufel werth.
Weitmäulige Laffen
Feilschen und gaffen,
Gaffen und kauffen.
Bestienhauffen,
Kinder und Fratzen,
Affen und Katzen !

Mögt all das Zeug nicht,
Wenn ichs geschenkt kriegt.
Dürft ich nur über sie !

ZIGEUNERBURSCH.

Wetter ! wir wollten sie

ZIGEUNERHAUPTMANN.

Wollten sie zausen,

ZIGEUNERBURSCH.

Wollten sie lausen.

ZIGEUNERHAUPTMANN.

Mit zwanzig Mann
Mein wär der Kram.

ZIGEUNERBURSCH.

Wär wohl der Mühe werth.

There can be no doubt that the Zigeunerhauptmann is Herder, and as little that the Zigeunerbursch represents Goethe. Here we find Goethe recognizing the great talents of Herder and his superiority to the common literary men of his time; recognizing also his ability and right to assault and rout the entire sickly brood. We find Goethe also expressing his own willingness to be a humble adjutant to so great a captain. One is at once reminded of the letter of Goethe (quoted by Grimm in his account of Herder's relation to "Goetz von Berlichingen," and quoted in this connection by Wilmanns), in which Goethe compares himself to Georg and Herder to Goetz. "Der Junge im Küras wollte zu früh mit und Ihr reitet zu schnell." Yet Herder is here a gypsy-captain. There is something bold and noble in him, but a wild flavor, a touch of communism, an Ishmaelitish Rousseauism. But Goethe is ready to follow him. In the "Pater Brey," too, Herder is a captain of dragoons, a reformer, but brought into contrast with Pater Brey-Leuchsenring, he represents a more orderly and rational antagonism to a seductive sentimentalism, and warns maidens against the dangers of a too familiar priesthood. Soldier and reformer in both pieces, he receives Goethe's respectful homage.

But Scherer, who admits the typified relation between Goethe and Herder here expressed by the Zigeunerhauptmann and the

Zigeunerbursch, believes that Goethe satirizes Herder in "Satyros," and Grimm conjectures that he is the original Mephistopheles. This conjecture of Grimm's Scherer, even after his clever and learned argument for the reference of "Satyros" to Herder for the original, corrects to a supposition that Herder *with others* furnished elements for the Mephistopheles, a very different and a very probable supposition. Can the variance between Goethe and Herder, lasting from the spring of 1773 to January, 1775, account for the presentation in "Satyros," so utterly unlike that in the "Jahrmarktsfest" and "Pater Brey"? It is a question worthy of serious consideration. Is it not possible that Goethe in "Satyros" satirizes himself, and gives to the passion, so ingrained in his nature, to bewilder and mystify his readers, its fullest scope?

Behind the Milchmädchen in the "Jahrmarktsfest" Wilmanns discerns and Scherer agrees with him in discerning Caroline Flachsland, Herder's betrothed. Wilmanns refers the purchase of the ring from the Marktschreyer-Schmid by the Zigeunerhauptmann for Caroline to a recommendation by Herder of Otway's "Orphan," published in a poor translation under Schmid's auspices. Herder alluded in a letter to Caroline to the piece and its indelicacy, but spoke glowingly of the character Monima. The modest Caroline failed to refer to the piece in her later letters to Herder, and the Darmstadt circle made merry over the *faux pas* of the gypsy-reformer. Scherer considers the purchase of the ring as an allusion to the protracted engagement between Herder and Caroline. The reader can take his choice between these interpretations. Caroline does not appear to have been a person of profound insight, and the expression "man sieht sich an den sieben Sachen blind;" is said by Scherer to characterize aptly her "uncritical admiration," which gushed forth on every occasion.

The ordinary assignment¹ of parts in "Pater Brey" also includes Caroline Flachsland, who is said to be represented by Leonora. As has already been stated, Balandrino is Herder and the Würzkrämer is believed to stand for Merck. It would be strange if this assignment of parts had no influence in suggesting to Wilmanns Merck as behind Haman, which suggestion it favors, since the Würzkrämer is hostile to Pater Brey, as Haman is to Mordecai.

The Schattenspielmann is Wieland according to Scherer. Wilmanns had already noticed that the Mercurius at the end of the Schattenspielmann's harangue must be Wieland's journal, the

¹ Goedeke, Vol. II, p. 718.

"Mercur," but he found in the pleonastic "sie" of the showman's language a probable but unintelligible reference to some definite person. Scherer thinks Goethe only intended to represent the manner in which a real showman of romantic nationality would mangle German. Perhaps the affected romanticism of Wieland was satirized by this comical repetition. Certainly Scherer's reference of the showman's demand for darkness in order that his magic lantern may undimmed send forth its rays, to the boasting assumption in Wieland's preface to the "Mercur" that his periodical would furnish by its reviews a great light in the darkness of German criticism, is apt, and gives probability to the idea that the facile Wieland was indeed the showman of the piece.

The analysis of the other characters reveals less well-known personages, and the evidence for the application is not always convincing. But if the farce with these explanations becomes to us full of the brightness and vigor of a great mind at play, what must have been the delight with which the initiated few, Merck and Frau von La Roche for instance, noted the sharpness of the hits (many of which are lost even for the great critics whom we have followed) and discerned the skill with which they themselves and other well-known personages were woven into a somewhat organic whole. How instructive the piece becomes under the analysis of these German scholars in regard to Goethe's mental processes in composition, for we are dealing here not merely with a phase, but also with a tendency, and what a hope it inspires that, when by and by the secrets of the Goethe-house are accessible, other and nobler creations of Goethe, as yet unknown in their genesis, will disclose the roots of their being! We shall then admire the characters no less, but the master still more, as it becomes more plain that nothing in human nature of sweetness, or grandeur, or ugliness escaped his searching eye; that the most diverse elements were happily united in his poetical fabrics; that his characters are so near and dear, because he ruled nature and transmuted the sweets of her every flower into honey for the cold, dull winters of a more prosaic time.

FRANKLIN CARTER.

III.—GEDDES' PROBLEM OF THE HOMERIC POEMS.¹

It would seem almost impossible to invent a new theory in regard to the Homeric poems. The line which stretches from Lachmann at one extreme to Nitzsch and Mure at the other, seems to have the different theories set on it so closely side by side and shaded so nicely into one another, that it would be impossible to get a foothold on it, to devise a new combination of the old elements which should differ perceptibly from all its predecessors. There is, of course, no shadow of a chance of any new element in the question. The traditions in ancient literature, the probabilities suggested by the poems themselves, the indications of the social state of the Greeks in the Homeric period—all these have been hunted out, combined and re-combined, doubted and defended, until they must have yielded their last drop of information. One might almost as well hope to discover a lost classical author in palimpsest or papyrus, as to find in any known writing a passage referring to Homer that has hitherto escaped notice, or to contrive a plausible theory as to the origin of the poems that will not infringe the patent of some German scholar. Yet here we have this very thing done by a daring Scotchman. Here is a tangible book, published in the year 1878, which propounds a theory of the origin of the poems which has never before, we believe, been suggested by any one. Such a phenomenon deserves attention, and every one interested in Homer must feel challenged to the attempt to form an opinion whether this book offers him the idle whims of a pedant, or another plausible theory, or the long-sought truth itself.

The theory advanced by Professor Geddes is avowedly an extension of that propounded by Grote in the second volume of his *History of Greece*, yet in the form which it takes and the concessions it demands it is virtually a new theory. It is so independent of Grote in its arguments that no one need study the earlier in order to understand the later theory. Still, as there is a natural

¹ *The Problem of the Homeric Poems.* By William D. Geddes, LL. D., Professor of Greek in the University of Aberdeen. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

connection between the two, and since the small end of a wedge ought generally to be put in first, it is better to state briefly Grote's theory and his arguments in defense of it, before we discuss our proper subject. The Iliad, he held, is an enlargement of a much shorter original, which, from its subject, would properly be called an Achilleid. This original poem consisted of Books I, VIII, XI-XXII, inclusive, and was confined in its subject to the wrath of Achilles, describing its cause, its consequences to himself and the Greeks, and its end, with the killing of Hektor by him as a natural sequel to the death of Patroklos. The added Books, II-VII, IX, X, XXIII and XXIV, describing the achievements of other heroes in the absence of Achilles, the embassy to him, the funeral games in honor of Patroklos, and the ransoming of Hektor's body, converted the Achilleid into an Iliad, that is, into a poem on certain incidents of the Trojan war, having the wrath of Achilles as its centre but not as its exclusive topic. There are, of course, no external arguments for this theory, or it would long ago have been propounded by some one else. The internal arguments upon which Grote rested it are drawn not from the linguistic features, nor from the poetic quality of the different books, but from the subject-matter. The promise of Zeus to Thetis given in the first book, that the Greeks should suffer in the war until the wrong done to Achilles was fully avenged, does not begin to be fulfilled, nor in any way to influence the course of events until the eighth book. There are difficulties in the story, awkwardnesses which seem to betray the putting in of a new piece upon old stuff, at both ends of the supposed addition, at the beginning of the second and at the end of the seventh book. The embassy sent to Achilles in the ninth book to offer him abundant compensation for the injury to his honor, which offer he indignantly rejects, is never referred to in the subsequent books, though several occasions for reference to it arise. These are the principal reasons which Grote assigns for regarding books II-VII and IX as additions to the original poem. It will be seen at once that they belong rather to the old-fashioned school of literary criticism than to the modern German method of scholarship. He treats the Homeric poems almost as one would treat Virgil or Milton, as if they were the work of one poet in a literary age, when books abounded, and the idea of authorship was well defined and familiar. That may, of course, be the proper and legitimate way of treating them, but we must admit that it is regarded by most German Homeric scholars of the present day as a fundamental error.

We find ourselves in somewhat the same atmosphere in reading Professor Geddes' book, although it must be confessed that in minute study and laborious gathering of particulars he is hardly surpassed by any German scholar. Still his theory makes almost the same division of the Iliad that Grote's does, and the arguments in support of it belong to the same general class. If it is assumed that one poet wrote one great portion of the Iliad and another the remainder, then it is natural to find in each portion views of the gods, of society, of nature, and of single characters, forms of expression and turns of thought, which do not occur in the other. This is the substance of Mr. Geddes' book, although, as he tells us, the process was in fact the reverse of what is stated above, and it was the observation of different views current in the different portions which suggested the difference of authorship. Still the whole theory implies such a conception of the origin of the poems as we have ventured to call old-fashioned. But it is time to state more precisely what the new theory is.

We have said that it makes nearly the same division of the Iliad that Grote proposed. Grote rejected from his original Achilleid Books II-VII, IX, X, and possibly also XXIII and XXIV. In addition to these Geddes rejects the speech of Nestor in XI (670-806), the description of the shield in XVIII, and the last hundred lines or so, all that follow the death of Hektor, in XXII. He goes through the poems with a series of tests, and with each one finds these portions of the Iliad differing from the rest and agreeing with the Odyssey. All these parts of the Iliad, then, he regards as an addition made by the same poet who wrote the Odyssey, and so he calls them the Ulyssean books, the rest being the Achillean. After this he endeavors to establish by somewhat similar internal evidence where this later poet lived, whom he regards as the true Homer, the person to whom the name and the traditions attached to it rightly belong. This opinion is founded mainly on the fact that the poet who wrote the Achillean portion shows a familiarity with Thessaly and its woodland scenery, and with the geography of this and the adjacent countries, whereas the poet of the Ulyssean portion and of the Odyssey seems to have lived in Asia Minor, with which latter region all the traditions associate the name of Homer. He finds also a subtle partisanship betrayed by the two poets, which goes to show the same thing. The one favors Achilles, the representative of the old Aeolo-Dorian stock of Greeks, and with him the chieftains of northern Greece, and the

habits of life and of mind which characterized the Dorian race. The other favors Odysseus and the heroes of southern Greece, and the traits familiar in later times as marking the races of Ionian stock. Thus this great division in the Greek family, which runs through all its history and reaches its climax in the terrible death-struggle of the Peloponnesian war, is seen to have begun as early as the heroic period, and to have left its mark on the form of the great national epic.

It seems right, though it is no part of our purpose to examine minutely the several arguments brought to sustain this theory, that we should give some idea of the nature of them, and to this end we will mention the principal tests which Professor Geddes applies to the poems. In this selection we omit some of the weaker ones, thus sacrificing the joys of an easy and palpable triumph. We mention first the one which Mr. Geddes says first "directed his own attention forcibly to the subject," the high estimate, in the Ulyssean books and the *Odyssey*, of Odysseus as the impersonation of spirit and intelligence. It is easy to show that he is prominent in the Ulyssean books, especially in II, III, IV, IX and X. The proof that he is not so in the Achillean books is drawn partly from two or three passages where his courage is apparently disparaged, and partly from the lack of reference to him in XII, XIII, XV, XVII, XVIII, XX-XXII. His absence from the scene in these books cannot, it is said, be adequately explained by the fact of his being wounded, though it is difficult to see why not, since Agamemnon and Diomedes, who are wounded with him in XI, are just as much absent from the scene in the above-mentioned books as he is. The three appear together in XIV and are repeatedly referred to together as wounded and hence absent, so that there appears to be no reason for regarding the lack of reference to one as due to any cause affecting that one only. In a somewhat similar way, the position of several other characters in the two sections respectively is discussed. Thus Achilles appears in the Achillean section as fierce and inexorable, with no feeling for any one but himself, if we except his intense love for Patroklos, whereas, in the Ulyssean portion, he is softened and humanized, as in the funeral games in XXIII, and the scene with Priam in XXIV. So Hektor, in the Achilleid, is overbearing and boastful, while in the rest of the *Iliad* he is modest, generous, and prone to melancholy. (This division of the character of Hektor, by the way, has been made the subject of trenchant criticism by Gladstone in the

"Nineteenth Century" for October, 1878.) So the author goes on, taking up Helen, the two Ajaxes, and others, and finding in greater or less degree a difference in the treatment of them in the two sections. In one case of very subordinate characters he makes a good point in favor of his theory, which, however, has been noticed before, though not used as in this book. It is, that in the Achillean books we find Polydamas, the Panthoid, as the adviser of Hektor, whereas in the Ulyssean section it is Helenos, a Priamid, who alone appears in that character. It is true, the appearance of Helenos in this relation is confined to VI and VII, so that little stress can be laid on that side of the argument, but on the other hand, Polydamas, who appears in every book from XI to XVIII (not XXII, as Mr. Geddes says) inclusive, is not once mentioned in the Ulyssean section. We have next a more interesting discussion in the shape of a comparison of the two sections as to the theology, the psychology and ethics, the manners and customs, recognized in them. Under each of these heads it is maintained that the Achillean books show an archaic stage of belief, opinion, and practice, as compared with that of the rest of the poems. In the narratives concerning the gods, in the conception of Zeus, in the meaning of the word *φρένες* in the ethical standards, in architecture, house-furniture, dress, diet, amusements, hospitality, commerce, marriage, etc., it is claimed that the Achillean area shows a comparatively rude and early type of thought and social life. This is perhaps the most valuable part of the book. It is full of interesting observations and nice distinctions, and bears witness to minute and laborious study on the part of the author. But it is impossible, without taking up far too much space, to give any more particular account of the matter contained in it. Next comes an original criticism, the treatment in the two sections respectively of the horse and the dog. Mr. Geddes finds that the horse is preëminently the favorite animal of the Achillean books, and the dog disparaged, while in the Ulyssean books and the *Odyssey* this relation of the two animals is just reversed. We must refer our readers for the particular evidence to the work itself, and we assure them that, along with not a few weak arguments and partial statements, they will find much valuable matter that probably cannot be found elsewhere.

There is, no doubt, much that is attractive in this theory; and the arguments in its defense, if not always so conclusive to other minds as they seem to Mr. Geddes, still contain valuable observations

on the contents of the poems, and deserve to be fairly met as arguments. It will not do for any one, because he accepts some one of the various analytic theories of German scholars, to throw aside this book without examination, as joining together what his theory puts asunder. For it may be that both are true; it may be that two poets contributed in such proportions as Mr. Geddes supposes to produce the result which we have before us, and yet that each took up earlier lays without material change into his poem. Herein is the difficulty, and, in part, the fascination of the "Homeric question"; there are so many possibilities, for any one of which some arguments may be found, and yet it is so difficult to frame a theory which shall satisfy all the conditions and fully account for the existence of these wonderful poems with all their perfections and all their inconsistencies in that age and state of society. It may be that Mr. Geddes is right. He may have detected one great fact in the history of the poems which explains many of their peculiarities, and must be taken into account in all future discussions. At present, we admit, he does not seem to have fully made out his case, and we shall point out in a moment some faults which we think his method involves. But the thorough discussion of his work, for which this is not the place, would require an examination of every one of his tests and all the passages which are adduced to support it, and a careful inquiry whether the facts are as he represents them, and whether they point to his conclusion or are to be interpreted otherwise. We do not mean to imply that he ever intentionally misrepresents the facts, but that, in order to pronounce upon the theme a positive judgment, one must bring to the reading a wider knowledge of the facts than the book itself gives him. For it must be admitted the book presents in general only the facts which support the view which the author holds to be the truth; in other words, it is an argument in defense of a theory. But the only person who is entitled to lay it aside as unworthy of his notice is one who, like Mr. Gladstone, accepts the poems as original units and every line as inspired, so to speak, by the genius of the one personal Homer.

The first criticism we should make upon Mr. Geddes' method is that it assumes the connection of the Ulyssean portions of the Iliad with one another and with the Odyssey in time and authorship. It is, perhaps, natural for one to do this with regard to the Ulyssean portions of the Iliad, when he has been influenced for a long time by Mr. Grote's able argument in support of his theory,

but the question must be raised whether there is any real ground for the assumption. And if true of those books, it is true (and this increases the difficulty a hundred fold) of them and of the *Odyssey* too. The whole *Odyssey*, is it one poem,¹ without any question of the *Telemachia*, or of the eleventh book, or of the lay of *Demodokos*? And then if the *Odyssey* is one poem by one author, how can we know it to be of the same time with the *Ulyssean* portions of the *Iliad*? Why does Nestor's speech in XI belong to the same period and author with the Catalogue in II, with the Shield of Achilles in XVIII, with XXIII and XXIV? Why does the *Glaukos* episode in VI, with all its peculiarities, belong to the same stratum with the rest of the *Ulyssean* books? It is apparent on a moment's thought how much of assumption is involved in this view, how many questions may be asked which must be answered without adequate reasons for the answer. But Mr. Geddes would protest against the phrase "assumption," and declare that he puts together those parts of the poems which, by internal evidence, belong together; that he first collected the data and then drew his inference from them; that, therefore, it is not an assumption, but a well-grounded inference. Let us admit that it is not an assumption; still it is not therefore certain to be a well-grounded inference. Grant that his collection of passages is full and his interpretation of them always correct, and it is still a question whether his inference is sound. For his data prove at the best that the Achillean books proceeded from one stage of society and one locality, and the *Ulyssean* books with the *Odyssey* from a later stage of society and a different locality. But they fall far short of proving that all these latter were produced at the same time and by the same hand, and this point, we think, he may justly be said to assume. The advanced civilization, the milder theology and manners which he finds in them, may have prevailed, we may indeed say, did prevail for a long period of time; why may not these different books and scattered passages have been produced at intervals during that period? There were many poets on the shores of Asia Minor in

¹ We cannot help regretting that this book, the most learned and elaborate contribution of English scholarship to the Homeric question since Mure, should so wholly ignore the work of Hennings, Kirchhoff, Köchly, and others, in demonstration of the want of unity in the *Odyssey*. It is true that Mr. Geddes follows in the steps of Grote (and many others) in assuming the unity of the *Odyssey* as a foregone conclusion, but there is this great difference, that the investigations above referred to were not published when Grote expressed his opinion, whereas now they have been accessible for many years.

the epic age; why may not half-a-dozen of them have contributed separately the "local mint-marks" on which he lays such stress? His argument establishes, we may for the moment grant, a limit after which these later portions of the poems must have been written; it gives, however, no reason whatever for fixing the point before which or the person by whom they must all have been written. It determines one limit, it may be, but contributes nothing to the determination of the other. And is the determination of the first limit altogether certain?

This question leads us to our second criticism, which is that in many instances he seems to find his evidence only in some single book or passage, or in some two or three only, and then to set it down as a feature of the Achillean or Ulyssean portion as a whole. A few examples will make this clear. The Catalogue in II gives the sole evidence of knowledge of the Dorians on the part of the Ulyssean poet (p. 63), and of the feeling of offense at the sound of a foreign language (p. 66). The Glaukos episode, in VI, furnishes the sole Ulyssean cases of the phrase "the gods who live at ease" (p. 134), and of the worship of Dionysos (p. 142). From the ninth book alone is the evidence drawn that the Ulyssean poet knew of Egypt (p. 64), that he recognized a higher degree of kindliness in domestic relations as shown by his use of certain adjectives (p. 79), that he applied the word *ἰλαος* to a mortal (p. 146; though why XIX, 178, where the Achillean poet does the same thing, should be discredited, does not appear), and that he used of a mortal the phrase *ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε* (p. 147). The tenth book alone gives proof that the Ulyssean poet divided the night into three parts as did the poet of the *Odyssey* (p. 176). Similar instances of evidence drawn from XXIV alone may be found on pp. 140, 150, 176, 330. These books and episodes, it will be noticed, are all such as have long been regarded as interpolations in the *Iliad*, a fact which prepares us for their differing from the rest of the poem in language and matter, and may explain why they alone in these cases furnish the needed evidence of resemblance to the *Odyssey*. So also from the Catalogue and the ninth book are drawn the references to Delphi (p. 63), the phrases implying a wider extension of meaning for the name Hellas (p. 68), the (very doubtful) evidences of the first beginning of regular festivals (p. 144), and the most important of the arguments (pp. 278-287) to prove that the Ulyssean poet lived in Asia Minor. From the Catalogue and the tenth book alone is it proved that the Paeonians

are represented in the Ulyssean books as archers (p. 123). These are all little matters, it is true, and might be passed over as weak points in an otherwise strong argument. But the argument here is a cumulative one, and as such derives its force chiefly from the number of cases on either side, be they little matters or great; hence it seems right to point out every deduction that ought to be made, however trifling in itself. In a similar way a number of points of difference between the two sections of the Iliad, and of likeness between the Ulyssean sections and the Odyssey, are established by single phrases occurring here and there in scattered books. Of course, such instances, all pointing in one direction, have a certain weight, combined with other arguments. But when we find so many isolated cases used as material of proof, we cannot help questioning the inference, especially when we remember Friedländer's calculation, that of all the separate words used in the two poems about one quarter occur only once.

Another criticism that we should make on this book is that it ignores too much the influence that the poet's subject has upon his use of words and upon his representations of life and character. This influence has long been recognized as the cause of part of the manifest differences between the Iliad and the Odyssey. Indeed, it is implied in Bentley's famous remark that Homer wrote the Iliad for men and the Odyssey for women. It is mentioned by Mr. Geddes several times with that application, but he expressly declares that no such difference of subject exists between the two sections of the Iliad itself. On this point we must take issue with him. It may easily be shown, we think, that there is a decided difference in this respect between his two sections of the poem, and such a difference as accounts for many of the divergent characteristics which he ascribes to difference of authorship. There are ten whole books of the Iliad in what he calls the Ulyssean section. It will be conceded at once that in four of these, II, IX, XXIII and XXIV, there is no fighting at all. The Achillean books, except the first, which, by the way, contributes very little to the array of proofs, are full of fighting; there is almost nothing in them but the fierce passions and clashing weapons of the battle-field. In the specified Ulyssean books, on the other hand, we find the same persons in the assembly, in the embassy, in the funeral games, and in the quiet of their tents. Is it not natural that there should be a difference in the ideas and views of life, in the very words of which the lines are composed, when so different scenes and occupations

are being described? Now how is it with the other six Ulyssean books? In the third there are 460 lines, of which 330 are taken up with the Teichoskopia and the return of Paris to Helen, while the only fighting is the brief and bloodless duel between Paris and Menelaos. The fourth book is mainly occupied with the breach of the truce by Pandaros and the tour of Agamemnon to inspect the Greek host, and the fighting is confined to the last hundred lines of the 544. Passing by for the moment the fifth book, we find in the sixth some hundred lines of battle, and then the Glaukos episode and the visit of Hektor to the city occupy the remaining 400 lines. The seventh book contains some ten lines of general fighting at the beginning, then the duel of Ajax and Hektor and the debates which result in the truce fill up the book of 480 lines. With the exception, then, of the fifth, we find these Ulyssean books to contain remarkably little fighting of the kind which characterizes all the Achilleid. Out of nearly 2000 lines in III, IV, VI and VII, only some 210 are of this character. To these we may fairly add the tenth book, to which the killing of Dolon and the sleeping Thrakians can hardly be thought to impart a strong likeness to the battles of the Achillean books. Thus we see that there is a real difference of subject between these books of the Iliad and the others from which this theory separates them, and it is such a difference as goes far to explain the difference of language and of mental horizon. It is in the Ulyssean books that we have the details of several assemblies with their debates, the narrative of the funeral games, the fullest accounts of the life of the heroes within their tents, the occasions which bring out the nobler side of the character of Achilles and Hektor and others. It is in these books only that we are taken within the walls of Troy (for the last hundred lines of XXII belong, on Mr. Geddes' theory, with these books), and see something of the home life of its royal family. Another fragment which the theory joins with these books, solely on the internal evidence, the Shield of Achilles in XVIII, agrees in subject with them, describing mainly scenes of peace. Like the rest, it produces the impression of a later and more developed stage of civilization, and this is really the essence of much of the divergence which Mr. Geddes has observed between the two sections of the poem. But how is it with the fifth book, which we have all this time left unnoticed? There we find plenty of fighting of the same kind that characterizes the Achillean books. It is the exception in the Ulyssean area, and it is worth noting in that connection that

Mr. Geddes finds it necessary often to qualify his statements with regard to the Ulyssean books by an exception in the case of this one. One word, for instance, *βροτολογύη*, occurs seven times in the Achillean area and not at all in the Ulyssean except in this fifth book, where we find it used five times. Several things in this book are noted as "echoes" or "imitations" of something in the Achilleid. Instances of this special position of the fifth book may be found on pp. 130, 134, 152, 157, 159, 201, 209, 210, 212, 231, 243, 257, 263, 274. We venture to say that no such list can be given of exceptions that need to be made in regard to any other book of either series. The case then stands as follows: The Achillean books, except the first, are in general full of fighting. The Ulyssean books differ in this respect, four of them having no fighting, five very little, and only one as much as the average Achillean book. This last one, moreover, the fifth, is the one which has more points of resemblance, on Mr. Geddes' system of comparison, to the Achillean books than any other of its Ulyssean companions. Can it be doubted then that this difference in subject, the presence or absence of the element of war, is the chief cause of the distinctions observed between the two sections of the Iliad? Let it be observed, moreover, that the same difference exists between the Achillean books and the Odyssey, and it seems clear that we may reasonably account in this way for a great part of the divergence of the Achillean books from all the rest and of the resemblance between the Ulyssean books and the Odyssey. But let us hear Mr. E. A. Freeman, who in the "Contemporary Review" for February, 1879, has anticipated this criticism upon the book: "Nor is it any answer to say that in the books of the Achilleid as being mainly taken up with fighting, such scenes are not to be looked for, while they were to be looked for in the other books which are of a more general character. For this is the very point, that this difference of character does distinguish certain books of the present Iliad from the others, and that this distinction coincides with a division already made on quite different grounds. The one poet keeps on his fighting scenes without interruption; the other interrupts his fighting to bring in pathetic scenes with Helen and Andromache. It would have been just as easy, if the poet had so willed, to diversify the later fighting with episodes of this kind as it was to diversify the earlier fighting in the same way." With regard to the coincidence of this distinction with another division (Grote's, we suppose, is meant), made on quite different grounds, we may admit in a measure the force of the remark. Grote and

Geddes do confirm one another, and with arguments of different kinds, although that fact cannot have the weight of an undesigned coincidence, for Geddes avowedly aims to establish Grote's theory, which, of course, was known to him from the first. Besides, he is obliged, in order to make out his case, to couple with the books which Grote excluded from his Achilleid, certain other detached passages. But the main part of Mr. Freeman's answer we cannot admit. There is no such diversifying of fighting scenes by peaceful ones in the Ulyssean portion, no such neglected opportunity for it in the Achillean portion, as he supposes. In the main Ulyssean portion as we have seen, there is one considerable stretch of fighting scenes, occupying the end of the fourth, the whole of the fifth, and the beginning of the sixth book, and with this exception the rest is free from general fighting. The Achilleid, on the other hand, contains the entirely peaceful first book, and several short episodes of similar character, such as the interview between Zeus and Hera in XIV, the announcement to Achilles of the death of Patroklos in XVIII, the assembly of the Greeks in XIX. Thus each portion is diversified, the Ulyssean once by the warlike passage in IV-VI, the Achilleid by the peaceful episodes just specified. What gives the impression of greater diversifying in the earlier portion is partly the occurrence of the two duels in III and VII, and the insertion of IX and X after the battle of VIII. What Mr. Freeman ought to say, to be in harmony with Mr. Geddes' theory and the facts, is that the Ulyssean poet has inserted more peaceful passages, with the one exception of the fifth book, into the warlike poem of the Achillean poet, and has inserted them where he could, at such distances as to diversify the one kind of narrative by the other. A fair parallel to the warlike passage of the fifth book amid peaceful scenes is afforded by the eighteenth and nineteenth books, which contain no fighting at all and stand in the heart of the Achilleid between the struggle over the body of Patroklos and the slaying of Hektor. And these two books we find furnish comparatively few examples of Achillean traits and several points of likeness to the Ulyssean books.

One more remark remains to be made upon this new theory, a remark which will suggest itself inevitably to any one acquainted with the modern discussion about the unity of authorship of the Homeric poems. Mr. Geddes' theory is open to the criticism which has been made on that of his predecessor, Grote. It does not take account of the inconsistencies that run through the whole texture of each of the poems. It recognizes the awkward junction of the

first and second books, the lack of reference to the promise of Zeus in II-VII, the non-recognition in any subsequent book of the embassy in IX, but there are many other and no less serious incongruities within the limits of the books which this theory groups together and ascribes to one author. For a full statement of these incongruities we must refer the reader to some of the many books on the Homeric question, for we have space here only to mention a few specimens. Within the Ulyssean area we have the grand review of the second book, issuing only in the indecisive duel of the third; then this in its turn is followed by the other duel of the seventh book which is narrated in entire forgetfulness, if not ignorance, of the earlier one (for the vague reference in VII, 69, amounts to nothing); the conduct of Diomedes in the Glaukos episode of the sixth book can hardly be reconciled with his conduct immediately before in the fifth. Within the Achillean area similar cases abound. In XI and XVI, the same mark of time occurs of the same day, although all the varied incidents of 4000 lines have come in between the two passages. Patroklos is sent on an errand by Achilles at the end of XI., but when he returns at the beginning of XVI, no reference is made to the errand by either of them. In XIII, there are two distinct accounts of the entrance of Poseidon upon the field of battle. In XVI and XVII there are two distinct accounts of the death and despoiling of Patroklos. These are but examples of the inconsistencies and contradictions that are to be found throughout the Iliad, and similar ones, quite as serious, appear in the Odyssey. Now of things like these this theory takes no account, except in so far as it is identical with Grote's theory, which was based on certain striking cases of inconsistency like those cited. If, then, Mr. Geddes' argument should stand examination, and it should come to be admitted that there are precisely such differences as he points out in the ideas and language of the two portions of the poems, and no others of different character favoring a division at some other point, then, after all that, we should still have to explain these inconsistencies which pervade the whole structure of both poems. The present theory, therefore, does not seem to supersede the "Klein-Lieder Theorie" in any of its forms, but rather to be a possible addition to it, applying to a later stage of the growth of the poems. The distinction which it aims to establish may really be a distinction between the contributions, not of two original poets, but of two editors or compilers of a mass of previously existing short epic lays.

LEWIS R. PACKARD.

IV.—ENCROACHMENTS OF *μή* ON *οὐ* IN LATER GREEK.

Every one who has read much Greek of the post-classic period must have noticed for himself that the negative *μή* is used by later Greek authors in various relations in which it would not be employed so readily, if at all, in model prose, and the editors of Plutarch and Lucian and Arrian and others of the more prominent writers of the second century have not failed to call attention to these deviations. But in the ordinary manuals the matter is touched lightly, if touched at all, and even more elaborate treatises on Greek Grammar are content with slurring over the phenomenon or with references to older explanations which the development of grammatical study has rendered obsolete.¹ Hermannus ad Vigerum is not an end of controversy now; a Latin or quasi-Latin translation of an idiom is not accepted as a proof of the correctness of a theory; and modern research requires a far wider basis of induction than was dreamed of once. True, every now and then we find a happy guess, a suggestive parallel; but the same great scholar, who compares *δτι μή πεπίστευεν* with *quod non crediderit* and recognizes the analogous function of Greek negative and Latin subjunctive, allows himself to account for *μή* in the famous passage, Il. 15, 41,² by suggesting: *nisi particula μή sic posita est ut cum dubitatione neget.* 'Germanice *wohl nicht*. Idque bene eo loco Iunoni convenit ut quae non possit satis liquido iurare non suo iussu Neptunum Graecis opitulari. (Hm. ad Vig., ed. 3, p. 805.)

It is unnecessary to say that the abuse of the words "objective" and "subjective" is rampant in some treatises, and so we are gravely told by Winer in regard to Mark, 12, 14: *εἴπεστι καὶ σον . . . διδύνει η οὐ; δῶμεν η μὴ δῶμεν;* [dass] das erste Mal nach der objectiven

¹ Such a huddle as we find, for instance, in Hartung, *Lehre von den gr. Partikeln* II 124, would not be possible to the most puzzle-headed grammarian now. So in Thuc. 1, 71, which is cited for *μή* after *δῆλος*, *μή* occurs in a generic relative sentence; in Thuc. 1, 90 (cited for *μή* after *όρος*), *μή* is virtually conditional. Of course such men make no historical distinction between classic and post-classic authors.

² *μὴ δὲ έμην ιέτητα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων | πημαίνει Τρῶας*, cited in Curtius, *School Grammar*, § 614 Obs., as a normal example of *μή* in oaths!

Begründung der Steuerzahlung gefragt, das zweite Mal eine subjective Maxime ausgedrückt wird—the simple fact being that *οὐ* belongs to *ἔξεστι*; and further on a beautiful objective and subjective distinction is set up between the actual *τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν* and the impossible *τὸ οὐ φαγεῖν*. Then again "strong" and "weak" are made to do yeoman's service. So Kühner (II p. 747) explains the later use of the causal *ὅτι μὴ* by the preference of the more vigorous negative "according to the usual course of language," and yet (II p. 751) considers *μὴ* with the inf. in Xen. Comm., 1, 2, 39 (*φαίνειν δ' ἀν ἔγωγε μηδενὶ μηδεμίᾳ εἰναι παιδευσιν κτέ.*), as a modest statement, a mere approximate guess of the author. It is no wonder that non-Hellenists stop their ears when *οὐ* and *μὴ* come up for discussion in our philological associations, if this vague use of terms is to be tolerated. And yet for many scholars the problem of the negatives has a special fascination; and many students of Hellenistic Greek will not be content to dismiss *μὴ* for *οὐ* with Cobet's convenient sneer at the *Graeculi*,¹ or with the equally convenient phrase, *soloecismus Alabandicus*.² For such corruptions do not come in without cause. If, according to the current phrase, the appreciation of the negatives was indeed so much enfeebled, we should expect the two to be exchanged pell-mell, whereas it is *μὴ* that has encroached on *οὐ*, while *οὐ* has troubled *μὴ* very little. If it could be proved that *μὴ* has more claim to be Aryan, there are some who would see in this change a harking back to a primal type, a species of atavism, a phenomenon especially appropriate at a period when Greek aspired to be the language of humanity. But, unfortunately, *μὴ* is a prohibitive, and claims of equally remote ancestry have been set up for *οὐ*, and such fancies, of which there are far too many in philological treatises, must be excluded from any serious research. What a sober investigator has to do, is simply to acquire possession of the phenomena and observe the categories under which they seem to fall. Some months ago, in resuming the study of one of the best of later

¹ [Alciphron Ep. 37, 2.] *δῆλός ἐστι μηδὲ δλως ἡμῖν ἐντευξόμενος.* Graeculi discri-
men inter *οὐ* et *μὴ* ita negligunt ut saepissime *μὴ* scribant ubi *οὐ* est necessarium,
VLL. p. 47. Perpetua negligentia Lucianus *μή*, *μηδείς*, *μηδέποτε*, caett. ponere
solet ubi *οὐ*, *οὐδείς*, *οὐδέποτε* erant ponenda . . . quae turpissima vitia sunt,
VLL. pp. 315, 316.

² *Ἀλαβανδιακὸς σπλοκισμός*, ὡς Φιλόξενος τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν ἔχηγομενος, διαν ἡ μὴ
ἀπαγόρευσις ἀπὸ τῆς οὐ κείται ὡς τὸ μὴ δι' ἐμὴν ἴστητα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσί-
χθων (Π. 15, 41), Steph. Byz.

Greek writers, and beginning to read him again in his entirety, I thought it might be well to re-examine Lucian's usage and employ the results thus gained as categories for further investigation. After completing my task, I received a dissertation by Dr. Adolf du Mesnil, of the Gymnasium at Stolp (1867), on the Differences of Lucianic from Attic Syntax, in which pp. 40-46 are devoted to the use of $\mu\nu$ for $\omega\nu$. It is not necessary for me to specify the shortcomings of his treatment from my point of view. At all events his work has not made mine superfluous. Like myself, the author did not have access to Fritzsche's *Quaestiones Lucianeae*, but unlike myself he finds Madvig a thoroughly satisfying portion. Du Mesnil has not undertaken to exercise any criticism, except so far as to leave out the *Philopatris*. He has also omitted the poems, the treatises in the Ionic dialect, and the *Lexiphanes* and *Soloecista*, which are grammatical quizzes (*qui consilio non eleganter scripti sunt*). The omission of the *De Dea Syria* and the *De Astrologia*, so far as the negatives are concerned, is a mistake, as Herodotus, who is more or less closely imitated, is a perfect Attic in that regard, and a deviation from the usage of the model would show a strong bent in the $\mu\nu$ direction;¹ but the inclusion of all the other tracts makes no difference as to the results, as Lucian and the pseudo-Lucians, whoever and however many they be, are as one in the use or misuse of the negatives. Now, Lucian was a careful student of Attic Greek, and in his *Soloecista* notices not only such gross blunders as $\delta\varphi\epsilon\lambda\omega\delta\omega\eta\sigma\gamma$, but such pardonable lapses as $\sigma\omega\eta\sigma\omega\omega\eta$, so that it could hardly have been absolute heedlessness of the earlier usage; and, indeed, we find him every now and then reverting to the classic norm. Cf. Du Mesnil, l. c. pp. 45, 46. The explanation is to be sought in the popular speech of the time. Lucian, man of the world as he was, avoided all affectation and followed the drift of the spoken language so far as it was not rude or solecistic. And for this he is greatly to be praised. Our schooldays' friend, Xenophon, has had to stand many fierce attacks of late on account of the peculiarities of his diction, and before long Tycho Mommsen and others will hawk him down from his pride of place as an elementary text-book. But, for my part, I like Xenophon rather the better now that he is in trouble. I am disposed to forgive him the crime of using $\sigma\omega\eta$, and I am glad to find that the military prig did get a

¹ There happens to be no misuse of $\mu\nu$ in the *De Astrologia*, which is a very short tract; the freedom of $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\omega\mu\nu$ (*De Dea Syria*, 17) will be noticed below.

little of the dust of his campaigns on him. And so, if Lucian's negatives are no better than those of my poor old Christian friend, Justin Martyr, and no worse than those of the vaunted Dio Chrysostomus,¹ I am content.

It will not be expected that I shall go into a detailed discussion of the classic differences between *oὐ* and *μή*. These differences, I must assume, are sufficiently well known, if not sufficiently well formulated, nor referred to sufficiently satisfactory causes. The view which considers *oὐ* as the negative of statement, *μή* as originally the negative of the will, I am content to accept. How the negative of the will comes to be used in all its varied relations, this is not the place to develop. Suffice it that we find these two negatives in the very beginning so clearly distinguished, so accurately used, that we can recognize in them a sharper modality than obtains even in the moods. Future indicative, subjunctive, and optative are in the Homeric time not so far from each other as are *oὐ* and *μή*. Still there is a certain border-land, which in the classic period was occasionally invaded by *μή*; and it is just this border-land on which *μή* has squatted so resolutely in the post-classic time; so that we may fairly say that the later use of *μή* is not so much an innovation as an extension; and it will be the object of this paper to follow the lines of intrusion, as far as possible.

1.—*Μή* with *oratio obliqua* infinitive.

A statistic of later usage would reveal, I think, that the most extensive encroachments of *μή* have been made in the territory of the participle, and the grimness of its hold there I shall have occasion to illustrate by and by; but historical research indicates another point at which *μή* has a better claim of preëmption, indeed so good a claim, that some of our dictionaries and grammars have actually misstated the facts of the language and ceded the infinitive after verbs of saying and thinking to *μή*. True, the natural negative of the infinitive as such is *μή*, and it was not until the infinitive had begun to represent the indicative that the negative *oὐ* could have been tolerated. But this toleration was established before our record, and the infinitive has as clear, if not so common, an *oratio obliqua* use in Homer as in Thucydides. So especially after

¹ Ueberall ist eine vortreffliche Sprache, ein rein gewonnener Atticismus, der mit bewundernswerther Meisterschaft beherrscht (Niebuhr). Bernhardy's judgment as to Dio's style is much sounder.

φημί: δς τέ με φῆς Αἴαντα πελάριον οὐχ ὑπομεῖναι, Il. 17, 174; cf. 21, 316; Od. 4, 664. We can therefore only guess at the primal state before the incoming of the future infinitive, which, as I have remarked elsewhere,¹ betokens unmistakably a new function of the infinitive, just as the incoming of the future optative marks a new function of the optative. Still there is a group of verbs of saying and thinking, which retain the old negative. Such are verbs of asseveration and belief, such verbs as *δρυνόναι*, *μαρτυρεῖν*, *πιστεύειν*, *πεπείσθαι*, and the like. **Ομνύμι*, I believe, is perfectly steady. In the example sometimes cited for *οὐ*, Plat. Apol. 35 C,² the *οὐ* belongs to the leading verb and not to the infinitive, a rectification which would seem to be unnecessary, if experience did not show how often commentators blunder in assigning the reference of words. Examples abound. So ἐπὶ δὲ μέγαν ὅρκον δμοῦμαι, μή ποτε τῆς εὐνῆς ἐπιβῆμεναι ηδὲ μιγῆναι; Il. 9, 132-3; cf. Od. 5, 178; Hdt. 1, 165. 2, 179; Ar. Vesp. 1047, 1281; Andoc. 1, 90; Lycurg. 76; Dem. 21, 119, etc. In like manner, *μαρτυρῶ μή*, Dem. 45, 15; cf. 40, 47. Especially interesting are the shifting constructions of verbs of belief in Greek, which run through the whole range of thought and feeling, and show now by the negative, now by the finite or infinitive dependency, that the notion was complex to the Greek mind. For *πιστεύω μή*, see Dem. 21, 221; Andoc. 1, 2; *πέποιθα μή*, Pind. Ol. 1, 104; *πέπεισμαι μή*, Plat. Apol. 37 A. Occasionally *φημί* and *λέγω*, occasionally *οἴομαι* and *νομίζω*³ join the ranks of these verbs, which involve the will, these verbs in which the utterance strives to make the statement good, and the thought is at once a wish.

Still examples enough are left in the classic authors to verify the deviation, e. g. *φαίην δὲ ἀν ἔγωγε μηδενὶ μηδεμίᾳν εἰναι παιδευσιν παρὰ τοῦ μή ἀρέσκοντος*, Xen. Comm. 1, 2, 39; *φίσομεν . . . μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀν μεῖζον ἢ ἔλαττον γενέσθαι*, Plat. Theaet. 155 A; *πάντες ἔροῦσι*

¹ Transactions of American Philological Association for 1878, p. 5.

² *δμώμοκεν οὐ χαριεῖσθαι οἷς ἀν δοκῇ αἰτῷ ἀλλὰ δικάσειν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους*.

³ It must be observed, however, that grammarians have not always been careful to distinguish the legitimate use of *μή* with the infinitive in apposition from this extended use of *μή* with the infinitive. So in Thuc. 1, 20 (cited by Kühner, II, p. 752): *πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα οἱ ἄλλοι Ἑλληνες οὐκ ὄρθως οἰονται ὥσπερ τοὺς Δακεδαμονίων βασιλέας μή μῷ φίλῳ προστίθεσθαι ἐκάτερον*, in which *μή προστίθεσθαι* is a substantive exemplification of the *πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα*, although I must confess I should prefer *τὸ τούς*. In the same manner we must explain: *καὶ τοῦτο ἐν ἔστιν ὡν φῆμι μηδένα ἀν ἐν βραχυτέροις ἔμοι τὰ αἰτὰ ποιεῖν*, Plat. Gorg. 449 C. Perhaps also Thuc. 5, 49, 5.

τὸ λοιπὸν μηδὲν εἶνατ κερδαλεώτερον ἀρετῆς, Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 18 (probable influence of a preceding ἵσθι); cf. προύλεγον . . . μή, Thuc. 1, 139 (notion of solemn promise); ἔλεγον μή, Plat. de Rep. 1, 346 Ε; οἶμαι δμᾶς μηδὲν (v. 1. οὐδὲν) ἀγνοεῖν τῶν εἰρημένων, Dem. 54, 44; ἐνόμισε μή ἀν γενέσθαι ποτὲ πιστὸν κτέ, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 59 (but Andoc. 1, 70, cited by Bäumlein, is a conditional clause); cf. Thuc. 6, 102 extr.

Now it is evident that this form of expression carries with it the emphasis of the witness on oath, so to speak the emphasis of desire, and hence the tendency to use it in the later time, which always leans toward the impressive. *Mή* with the infinitive is equivalent to "I swear," "I vow," "I bet," instead of quieter forms, and how common this *oratio obliqua μή* is in Lucian is known to every reader of the Pantagruelist of Samosata, as George Saintsbury has happily called him.

So *μή* occurs after φημί: De Peregr. Morte 44 (III 363); Dialog. Meretr. 10, 2 (III 306); Paras. 27 (II 857); Bis accus. 28 (II 827); Iupp. trag. 35 (II 683); Gall. 17 (II 728); Eun. 6 (II 355); Iupp. confut. 6 (II 630); Apol. pro merc. cond. 13 (I 722); Epistul. Saturn. 20 (III 403); Abdic. 4 (II 162).

After λέγω: Iupp. trag. 17 (II 661); Vit. auct. 16 (I 556); De Dea Syria 17 (III 464); Abdic. 1 (II 159); Pisc. 35 (I 614); De Salt. 63 (II 301).

After εἶπον: Hermot. 29 (I 770); Hist. conscr. 29 (II 38); De Peregr. Morte 18 (III 342).

After οἶμαι: Salt. 22 (II 280); Tox. 8 (II 515); Nav. 1 (III 247). δοκεῖς: Dem. encom. 30 (III 512).

ἔστιας: Anach. 14 (II 892).

Oratio obliqua generally: Nigr. 14 (I 53); Icarom. 32 (II 789); Alex. 57 (II 262); Pro Imag. 10 (II 489); Tox. 20 (II 528), 40 (II 548); Dial. Meretr. 9, 2 (III 302); Philops. 34 (III 61); De Salt. 21 (II 280); Vera Hist. II 18 (II 115, 116); Dem. encom. 24 (III 508).¹ Ως *μή* with fut. inf. Dial. Deor. 21, 1 (I 268), is due to the influence of οὐχ ἀν πεισθείην.

¹ Having mentioned Dio as a sinner in this regard, I subjoin a few passages: For φημί *μή*, Or. 11 (p. 173 M.), 23 (p. 299), 31 (pp. 315, 349), 32 (p. 392), 40 (p. 492); λέγω *μή*, Or. 36 (p. 452); εἶπον (in combination with δονυμί): δίναμαι γὰρ δύσσας εἰπεῖν μηδεμίαν ἀλλὰν ἐμοὶ κρείττονα πεφηνέναι, Or. 47 (p. 525); καταμηνῶ *μή* (cf. μαρτυρῶ *μή*), Or. 59 (p. 575); μέμφομαι *μή* (cf. μέμφομαι δτι *μή* below), Or. 74 (p. 641); οἶμαι *μή*, Or. 7 (p. 104), 11 (p. 153), 16 (p. 216), 31 (p. 337), 47 (p. 526); ηγοῦμαι *μή*, Or. 53 (p. 555).

2.—"Οτι *μή*.

The next group, genetically speaking, to be noticed is the *δτι μή* group. This seems to have been the resumption of an old growth, the development of which was checked. We have already seen in Homer a *μή* with the indicative in an oath, and so with the *δτι* form we have in Theogn. 659: *οὐδὲ δρόσατι χρὴ τοῦθ' δτι μή ποτε πρᾶγμα τέθενται*, which is an easy step after the Homeric *λέστω* . . . *μή μὲν τοῖς ἵπποισιν ἀνὴρ ἐπιβήσεται ἄλλος*, Il. 10, 329, 330. In Antiphon we have (5, 21): *αὐτὰ ταῦτα σκοπεῖτε δτι μή προνοίᾳ μᾶλλον ἐγίγνετο η τύχη*, where Mätzner would write *οὐ* and Kühner (II 747) makes the somewhat feeble suggestion that *δτι μή* is after the analogy of *δπως μή* after *σκοπεῖν*. The imperative may have its influence here as the anticipated optative *μήτ' ἐπισταίμην* may be responsible for the puzzling *δπως σὸν μή λέγεις* of Soph. Antig. 685. But these deviations are, after all, so rare that we must not insist on them as any more than examples of the potentialities of *δτι μή*, and for this stage of the language we must rather connect the *δτι μή that not* in declarative sentences with the use of *μή* with the infinitive in *oratio obliqua*. It is clear that in a period in which *μή* could be used freely after a verb of saying, this form *δτι μή* would suggest a convenient equivalent for an *oratio obliqua* expression which would answer alike after principal and historical tenses, from the former of which *δτι* (*δτι οὐ*) with the opt. is excluded. It were indeed worth inquiry whether this form *δτι μή* with indicative did not help to throw out *δτι οὐ* with the optative. At all events, we find the optative form of *oratio obliqua* becoming rarer and rarer, and, when it is used, used with a certain uneasiness. I have sometimes thought that the legitimate *δτι μή except*, being a well-known combination, might have led to the more general acceptance of the illegitimate *δτι μή*, for we find elsewhere that when a combination becomes familiar to the ear, it is readily used out of all proper relation to its sense. But a discussion of this subject would require a separate chapter, and I return to my immediate theme.

It appears then that in Lucian, as in other authors of the post-classic time, *δτι μή* is used as a form of *oratio obliqua*, either entire or partial, i. e., where we should have in classic Greek the infinitive or *δτι* with the opt., or where we should have *ώς* with the participle. In many combinations the construction bears a strong analogy with the Latin *quod* and subjunctive, the subjunctive

element being represented by the "subjective" negative; and just as in *quod* sentences, object and cause are fused.

So especially after verbs of emotion and expressions of emotion (praise and blame)=*quod c. coni.*

ἀγανακτεῖν: Nigr. 24 (I 64); Alex. 55 (II 59); Phal. I 6 (II 193).

αἰτιᾶσθαι: Nigr. 32 (I 74); Hermot. 71 (I 813); Epist. Sat. 36 (III 415); Demon. 24 (II 385).

ἀνιᾶσθαι (ἐπὶ τούτῳ δτὶ μῆ) Apol. 15 (I 723); cf. ἀνιαρὸν (ἐκεῖνῳ δτὶ μῆ) Pro Imag. 16 (II 494).

ἀχθομαι: Dial. Deor. 15 (I 266); Dial. Mort. 15, 2 (I 400).

δεινότατον (τὸ δὲ πάντων): Dial. Deor. 24, 2 (I 275); Salt. 4 (II 268).

διασύρειν: Nigr. 31 (I 73).

ἐπαινεῖν: Nigr. 21 (I 59, 60).

θρύπτεσθαι: Dial. Meretr. 12, 1 (III 310).

χαταγιγνώσκειν: Epistul. Sat. 3, 32 (III 412).

λυπεῖν: Dial. Mort. 10, 11 (I 374).

μέγα φρονεῖν (ἐπὶ τούτῳ δτὶ μῆ) Pseudol. 18 (III 176).

μέμφεσθαι: Hermot. 50 (I 792).

μεμφιμοιρεῖν: De Sacrif. 1 (I 326).

μέμφις: Tox. 16 (II 254).

μεταγιγνώσκειν: Catapl. 17 (I 369).

μυσάττεσθαι: Menipp. 12 (I 473).

While *μῆ* with inf. is preferred after verbs of saying and thinking, still we find

εἰπεῖν δτὶ μῆ, Cronosol. 12 (III 395), imperative complex.

προστιθέναι δτὶ μῆ: Pro Imag. 6 (II, 487); Icaromen. 21 (II 766).

ἀποκρίνεσθαι δτὶ μῆ: Diss. cum Hesiodo 4 (III 242).

Cf. ἔλεγε δὲ ἡ Μαῖα ὡς μηδὲ μένοι τὰς νύκτας ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, Dial. Deor. 7, 4 (I 224).

Also δτὶ μῆ=διέτι μῆ in a quasi *oratio obliqua*: Abdic. 22 (II 178); Column. non temere cred. 25 (III 156); Dial. Mort. 21, 2 (I 422); De Peregr. Morte 42 (III 362).

It is true that δτὶ μῆ is frankly used after verbs of knowing, but there are often mitigating circumstances.

εἰδέναι δτὶ μῆ, Catapl. 26 (I 268), Hist. conscrib. 29 (II 40), Vera Hist. I 33 (II 97), the last in a clause of purpose.

πιστεύειν δτὶ μῆ: Timon 20 (I 131), in which consider the influence of πιστεύω mentioned above.

πεισθῆναι δτι μή: Asin. 13 (II 581).

μανθάνεντι δτι μή: Dial. Deor. 20, 10 (I 261), where *δπως μάθης δτι μή* . . . *ἔχω* is used as if = *εμὲ μὴ ἔχουσαν* (final complex).

μεμνῆσθαι δτι μή, Rhetor. praec. 26 (III 28), in an imperative complex. Likewise Charon 1 (I 490).

So also *δῆλον δτι μή*: Abdic. 14 (II 172), *δηλῶσαι δτι μή* Ep. ad Nigr. (I 38).

Add sentences which have a correlative to *δτι* and in which the *oratio obliqua* notion is obscured. So *τοῦτο δτι μή* Zeuxis 1 (I 840); Adv. indoct. 10 (III 109). Here *δτι μή* in ind. is treated as if it were *τὸ μή* with inf. In Hist. consrib. 40 (II 54), we have partial obliquity.¹

3.—Causal *μή*.

When we come to the clearly causal sentences, which in classic Greek take *οὐ*, we find that as object *δτι* and causal *δτι* run in the same groove, so *διότι* follows the simple *δτι*.

Oratio obliqua influence is seen in Philops. 30 (III 56); Dial. Mar. 5, 1 (I 300); Iupp. confut. 16 (II 639); Hermot. 20 (I 729); Dial. Deor. 2, 1 (I 206); Cyn. 11 (III 545). In Prom. s. C. 20 (I 203) and Pro Imag. 24 (II 504) causal and conditional relations approach each other.

The combination *ἐπεὶ μή*, which is especially grating to a student of Attic, may be due to the analogy of *δτι* (*διότι*) or to some obscure feeling of connection with *εἰ* or to the working of the causal relative element, of which more presently.

Examples: Amor. 4 (II 401); Phal. I 6 (II 193); Hist. consrib. 3 (II 5); Vera Histor. I 4 (II 72), II 32 (II 128); Hermot. 22 (I 760), 47 (I 788); Dem. Encom. 5 (III 494); Dial. Meretr. 10, 2 (III 306), 15, 2 (p. 323).²

¹ Parallels can be had for the seeking. So, to go no further than Dio Chrysostomus, we have *δτι μή* in *oratio obliqua* Or. 6 (p. 93); 31 (pp. 317, 323, 324); 3, 4 (414). After *διολογεῖν* (which often takes *μή* with inf.) Or. 45 (p. 515). In an imperative complex Or. 31 (pp. 322, 344); 35 (p. 432); 38 (p. 478); 50 (p. 542). So, also, after opt. with *ἀν* (quasi-imperative) Or. 40 (p. 493). In a conditional complex Or. 16 (p. 216); 31 (p. 319). In an infinitive complex Or. 31 (p. 350). For the emotional group cf. *θαυμαστὸν δτι μή* Or. 31 (p. 344) and *δχθομαι διότι μή* Or. 38 (p. 474). The simple object-sentences do not seem to be very numerous in Dio e. g. Or. 17 (p. 249); 31 (p. 316); 34 (p. 416); 38 (p. 571). On *δτι μή* in Justin Martyr cf. Apol. I 24, 9 (*ἐγκαλῶ*); 26, 35 (*ἐπισταμαι*); II 3, 16 (*ἐλέγχω*). For *δε μή* with opt. I 26, 21.

² The effect of *cum c. coni.* is closely analogous.

4.—Relative *μή*.

Another important extension is to be noticed in the relative sentence. Even in classic times the negative of a relative clause is *μή* when the relative gives the notion of characteristic, and as the characteristic sometimes gives a ground, the clause with *μή* seems to be causal outright. Here the subjective element represented by *μή* would appear in standard Latin as the subjunctive. Causal relatives thus begin to take *μή*, and causal relatives are followed by adversative relatives, which are in this way fused with concessive, opposing fact with granted notion, and this is extended to the integral parts of the relative sentence. Of classic authors Sophocles is especially free in using *μή* with the relative. ὁ δύστανα γένη βροτῶν, οἵς μή μέτριος αἰών: Phil. 178, foll.; cf. vv. 254, 408, 713; O. R. 816; O. C. 1680; Antig. 586; El. 911; Trach. 818 (see Bäuml. Gr. Partikeln S. 294). But Sophocles is not alone, and many a passage which would be set down in a post-classic author as a *foedissima locutio* is duly admired in a standard writer. There we are quick enough with our conditional conception, our particular example as generic and the like. So when Herodotus says (8, 61): ὁ Κορίνθιος Ἀδείμαντος ἐπεφέρετο στγᾶν τῷ (sc. Themistocles) *μή* ἔστι πατρίς and Aeschin. I, 24: τῷ πόλει ὑπέρ ἡς τὰ δπλα *μή* τίθεσαι ἡ διά δειλίαν *μή* δυνατὸς εἰ ἐπαριῦναι μηδὲ συμβουλεύειν ἀξίου; cf. Luc. Eun. I (II 350): τοιτὶ δὲ πλέον τοῦ συνήθους εἰναι μοι δοκεῖ, ἐφ' ὅτῳ μηδὲ κατέχειν δυνατὸς εἰ τὸν γέλωτα. This *quippe qui* use, so to speak, is very common in later Greek. I subjoin a few examples which are at hand: ὁς γε μηδὲ τῶν οἰκειοτάτων ἀπέσχετο, Catapl. 26 (I 648); θεῶν τινος εὐμενεῖα σώζεσθαι μοι δοκεῖτε οἱ μηδέπω ἀπολώλατε, Anach. 33 (II 913); cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 11 (p. 188); 31 (pp. 332, 334, 348); 32 (p. 375); 34 (p. 417); 36 (p. 442); 40 (pp. 488, 497).

Examples of *δπου μή*: Phal. I 8 (II 195); Bis accus. 20 (I 815); De Peregr. Morte 24 (III 347). *ἐνθα μή*: De Peregr. Morte 22 (III 345); cf. also the causal relative *δσῳ μή*, Alex. 2 (II 209); Imag. 23 (II 483-4).

Especially noteworthy is the negative *μή* in relative clauses after a negative (*nihil est quod c. coni.*): οὐδέν ἔστιν δτι *μή* πεποίηκάς με, Dial. Deor. 2, 2 (I 206); οὐδέν γάρ ἔστιν δτι *μή* αἱ Μοῖραι διατάττουσιν, Iupp. conf. 1 (II 627); cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 29 (p. 293), 34 (p. 419) and Strabo 6 (p. 286).

Relative opt. and *ἄν* with *μή* (characteristic), Lexiph. 25 (II 349); De Merc. Conduct. 20 (I 276); Eun. 8 (II 357).

5.—Participial *μή*.

The relatives with *μή*, then, may be passed over without elaborate comment. Not so the participle with *μή*, the frequent and, if you choose, illegitimate use of which is a marked peculiarity of later Greek, and survives in the modern tongue, which does not allow any other negative to be used with the participle.¹ Perhaps the easiest way of mediating the transition is through the relative equivalent of the participle, and yet, the ordinary categories for the use of *μή* with the participle will yield far more closely normal results than might be supposed at first. Equivalency of cause and condition, the adversative and the concessive, as presented from different points of view, will go far to explain cases which are considered solecistic by the hasty critic, e. g.

Conditional-causal: *μηδέπω . . . ἔχόντων*, Amor. 23 (II 423); *ἀγανακτήσας καὶ μὴ φέρων*, Alex. 45 (II 251); cf. Bis acc. 31 (II 830); Vera Hist. II 1 (II 104); Dial. Deor. 14, 2 (I 239); *μηδὲ σίτον αἴρεισθαι θέλοντος*, Tox. 29 (II 538); *μηδενὸς ἀνεχομένου*, Gall. 11 (II 718); *μηχέτ' ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκείου σχήματος διαμένων*, Bis acc. 33 (II 833); *τὸ μὲν τῆς πατρίδος δύνομα μήτε εἰδότες μήτε στέργοντες*, Encom. patr. 10 (III 233); *μήτε ὀρῶν μήτε ἀκούων*, De Merc. Cond. 18 (I 674); *πολλοὶ . . . ἐναπέθανον τῷ ἀγῶνι μὴ ἀξιώσαντες ἀπαγορεῦσαι*, Anach. 38 (II 919); *εὖ γε ἐποίησε μὴ ὅμοσε χωρίσας τοῖς θηρίοις*, Hist. conscr. 29 (II 40), cf. Dialog. Meretr. 15, 3 (III 324); *ἐλυπούμην γὰρ σὲ μὴ ἔχουσα*, Dialog. Meretr. 12, 4 (III 314); *μηδὲν μηησθέντος τῆς πατρίδος* (==δες *μηδὲν ἔμνήσθη*), Hist. conscr. 14 (II 20).

The causal use of *μή* with the participle goes so far as to embrace *ἄτε*, as De Merc. Cond. 23 (I 678); Hermot. 51 (I 792); Icaromen. 13 (II 766); Cal. non temere cred. 23 (III 153) and 27 (III 157); De domo 3 (III 191); and the construction *ώς μή* with the participle instead of *ώς οὐ* is also to be noticed: Phal. I 14 (II 200); De domo 21 (III 203).

Concessive-adversative: *μήτε ἐρομένου τινὸς μήτε πεμφθέντος* (changing with *οὐδὲν*), Alex. 50 (II 255); *μηδὲ τυχόντες*, Diss. cum Hesiodo 1 (III 241); *μὴ φοβηθεῖς*, Dial. Deor. 19, 2 (I 251); *μηδέν σε εἰργασμένου*, Lexiph. 17 (II 343); *μὴ πρότερον ἐξετάσας*, Hermot. 73 (I 815); *μὴ μαθών*, Adv. indoct. 3 (III 101); *μηδὲ φέρεν*

¹ Mullach, p. 389. The predominance of *μή* there has its parallel in the use of *δοτις* for *δες*.

δυνάμενος, *ibid.* 7 (III 106); μήτε Φιλίππου ἐπιόντος μήτε Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπιτάττοντος, *Rhet. praec.* 10 (III 11).

Especially noteworthy is the participle with *μή* following an adjective, which is an analogous phenomenon to the familiar Latin combination, in which *qui* with the subjunctive is used as a parallel for an adjective characteristic. So *ψυχρόν* ἐστι μηδὲ δλήγον *σπινθῆρα* *δργῆς* . . . *διαφυλάττον*, *Timon* 1 (I 100); *πρὸς ἄνδρα* *χομιδῆ* *ἐλεύθερον* . . . *μηδὲν* *δύνοντα* *δνειδίζειν*, *Pseudol.* 1 (III 162); cf. 2 (III 163); ἡ ἄκρα *εὐδαιμονία* . . . μήτε *ἀπολέσθαι* μήτε *ἐπιβουλευθῆναι* *δυναμένη*, *Navig.* 44 (III 277); *παλαιὸς* *ὑπὸ γήρως* . . . *ἐξερπύσαι* *μή δυνάμενος*, *Philops.* 12 (III 40).

If such participles had the article, the sensibilities of our grammarians would not suffer the same jar, and the current explanation of abstract notion would come in. But the article is not necessary to the characteristic, though certainly auxiliary. It is, indeed, customary in a characteristic. So commonly *μηδείς* with, *οὐδείς* without the article, and there may possibly, though not probably, be no deeper meaning in Euripides' *τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν βέπει* than "nothing comes to naught," like the *οὐδὲν καὶ μηδὲν τῶν μερόπων τὸ γένος* of the Greek Anthology; but still we have *Soph. El.* 1000: *ἥμιν δ' ἀπορρεῖ* *χάπι μηδὲν ἔρχεται*, and there are sporadic examples enough of *μή* with the anarthrous participle in standard Greek to show that the post-classic use is a genuine germinal growth out of the old time.

Still there is a goodly number of occurrences left which resist any such analysis, and must be referred to the same process of extension which enlarged the sphere of the subjunctive in Latin, the tendency to color facts by feelings, which displays itself in the history of the moods of *cum*. But a complete discussion of all the Lucianic participles with *μή* that may be called simply circumstantial would require more space than the importance of the subject demands. An additional list of such occurrences of participial *μή* as seemed to possess especial interest must suffice. Some of them, it is true, may possibly be referred to the special categories given above, but most of them must be abandoned to the uncovenanted mercies of the grammarians.

Πῶς οὖν ἀχριθής δ' Αλακός ἀν οὐ διέγνω σε μή ὅντα ἔκεινον; (=εἰ μή η σθα?)
Dial. Mort. 16, 2 (I 403); *μηδὲ ξυνείς* (*δρόταν* *complex*), *Char.* 9 (I 500);
μηδὲ δειπνήσας, *Char.* 17 (I 514); *μηδὲν τῶν μελλοντῶν εἰδότε*, *De domo* 31 (III 207); *μήτε προσειπῶν μήτε προσομιλήσας*, *De domo* 1 (III 190);
ὑπὸ μηδενὸς ἐνοχλούμενος, *Bis accus.* 5 (II 798); *μήτε φωνήν ἀφιέναι*
μήτε ἔσταναι δυνάμενον, *Bis accus.* 17 (II 813); *μηδεμίαν νύκτα*

ἀπόχοιτος γιγνόμενος, *Bis accus.* (II 825); μηδὲ ἐλπίζων, *Asin.* 31 (II 601); μηδὲν τοῦ δόλου εἰδώς, *Asin.* 47 (II 615); ἄνθρωπος μὴ γελῶν, *Paras.* 51 (II 876); δ ταῦρος μηχέτι φυλαχθείς, *Phal.* I 13 (II 200); μηδενὸς καταναγκάσαντος, *De Peregr. Morte* 16 (III 341); ἀμελούμενος καὶ μηχέθ' δμοίως περίβλεπτος ὥν, *De Peregr. Morte* 20 (III 344); μηδεμιᾶς δὲ τολμώσης τὴν φῆφον καθ' αὐτῆς ἐνεγκεῖν, *Charid.* 10 (III 624); παρέρχεται μηδὲν ἐνοχλήσας τοὺς ιδόντας, *Philops.* 19 (III 47); μήτε μελλήσας μήτε σύμβουλον προσλαβών, *Abdic.* 5 (II 163); μηδὲν καλλιλογησάμενος, *Tox.* 35 (II 544); τράπεζα μηδὲν ἔχουσα (=ῆτις μηδὲν εἰχεν), *Asin.* 2 (II 569); μήτε πλευρῶν φεισάμενος μήτε μηρῶν, *Asin.* 2 (II 586); πρὸς μηδὲν τῶν δεινῶν ἐγδιδόντα, *Dem. encom.* 33 (III 515); μηδὲ τῶν ἀπορρήτων μηδὲν γέ πέφυκεν ἔχειν ἐῶντες, *Cynic.* 14 (III 547); ἐκοινολογεῖτο . . . τῇ Λαμπρίου ἐταίρᾳ, μηδέπω ἐκείνου παρόντος, *Dialog. Meretr.* 3, 2 (III 284); μηδὲν λογισάμενος . . . μηδὲ δτι . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ παράπαν ἐξετάσας, *Cal. non temere cred.* 3 (III 129).¹

But, if in these and like cases the development of doctrine blooms out into a bold and bad heresy, is it not wiser to make the effort to understand the transition than to sneer at the language of the *Graeculi*, who may, after all, have caught many secrets of Greek expression which are still hid from our eyes?

¹ As I have elsewhere made use of parallels from Dio Chrys. I will append here a brief list illustrative of his employment of *μή* with the participle: *Circumstantial Or.* 6 (p. 93); 11 (pp. 174, 181). *Adversative* 11 (p. 191). *Oratio obliqua complex* 30 (p. 308); 32 (p. 376). *Causal* 32 (p. 377). Add *Or.* 30 (406); 41 (p. 498); 56 (p. 567); 61 (p. 580); 80 (p. 666). On the use of *μή* with the participle see further my notes on *Justin Martyr*, *Apol.* I, 5, 4 and 9, 4 and the list of references in the index.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

NOTES.

THE DIONYSION AT MARATHON.

More than a year ago, the torrent which passes the present village of Marathon, having, during a freshet, carried away a portion of its bank at a point almost equidistant from Marathon, Vraná (Probalinthos), and Kato-Souli (Trikorythos), brought to light an inscription, which is interesting on several accounts. It was printed at the time in several of the Athenian daily papers, and shortly afterward in an article by Mr. Sp. Lampros in the *Παρνασσός*, September, 1878, pp. 727-731. It runs thus:

Τετραπολέες τῶι Διο-
νύσῳ ἀνέθεσαν
Λυσανίας Καλλίου Τριχ-
ορύστοσ ήρχεν. Ἱεροποιοί.
Φανόδωρος Μαραθώνιος,
Μελάνωπος Τριχορύστος,
Φελοκλῆς Οίναῖος,
Ἀντιχράτης Προβαλίσιος.

Several things are shown by this inscription:

1. That the plural of *Τετραπολεύς* might be *Τετραπολέες*, as is asserted by Stephanos Byzantios.
2. That the Attic Tetrapolis was governed by a local Archon, as late, at least, as B. C. 442, the earliest date assignable to the inscription.
3. That there was, near Marathon, a temple of Dionysus, at which the four towns composing the Tetrapolis offered a common worship.

The existence of this temple has hitherto been ignored both by topographers and archaeologists, and, indeed, Mr. Lampros, who is the most promising of the younger Greek philologists, says in his article: *Πολλὰ λοιπὸν ἀφίνει τὰ σκοτεινὰ ἡ σπουδαία αὐτῇ ἐπιγραφὴ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ ἐν σχέσει πρὸς τὰ περὶ αὐτῆν. Ἀλλ' ὅπωσδήποτε δὲν*

φαίνεται ἀπίθανον ὅτι ἔνθα εὑρέθη αὐτῇ καὶ τάλλα περὶ ὃν εἶπον ἀνωτέρω, ἔκειτό ποτε ναὸς τοῦ Διονύσου, καὶ τοις οὐδεμίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίᾳ περιεσώθη παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαῖοις συγγραφεῦσι. Καὶ φαίνεται μὲν πως ἀντικειμένη πρὸς ταύτην τὴν γνώμην ἡ Ὑπαρξίας τάφων ἐν τῇ πλησιεστάτῃ γειτονίᾳ τοῦ λέθου, ὡς εἶπον, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ πράγματος σχέσιν θὰ δεῖξῃ ἡ σκαπάνη.

It is to correct the statement that there is no mention of the Marathonian Dionysion in any ancient author that I have written this brief note. In Bekker's *Anecdota Graeca*, p. 262, in a lexicon of *Ἀλέξεις βῆτορικαί*, we find the following: "Ηρως ιατρός: δ' Ἀριστόμαχος, ὃς ἐπάφη ἐν Μαραθῶνι παρὰ τὸ Διονύσιον καὶ τιμᾶται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων. This proves not only that there was a Dionysion at Marathon, but also that there was at least one tomb close by it. The Aristomachos referred to seems to have been the son of Iolaos and brother of Adrastos.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

ON ILIAD B, 318-319.

τὸν μὲν ἀίδηλον θῆκεν θεός, ὃς περ ἔφηνεν·
λᾶαν γάρ μιν ἔθηκε Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω.

The textual difficulties of this passage are well known. The MSS. all have *ἀίδηλον*, except the Ambrosian, which is the oldest that has reached us on this part of the Iliad and cannot be placed later than the sixth century. Here *ἀίδηλον* is found, with *ἀρίδηλον* inserted by a later hand. Zenodotus wrote *ἀρίδηλον*, in the same sense as *ἀρίζηλον*. Aristarchus appears to have read *ἀίδηλον* or *ἀίζηλον*, with the meaning "unseen", and this is preferred by the Ven. Schol., and must have been in Cicero's copy, since he renders (De Div. 2, 30):

qui luci ediderat, genitor Saturnius, idem
abdidit, et duro firmavit tegmina saxo.

Buttmann (Lexil. 10) has argued strongly for the same sense, though doubtful about the form *ἀίδηλον*; while Curtius (Etym. 644) has shown that the form is analogically correct, and asserts that "we need have no hesitation about accepting it as a reading." Ameis adopts *ἀίδηλον*, but attempts to prove its meaning to be the same as *ἀρίδηλον*; and he remarks as follows upon Curtius: "One

may wish some slight proof that in the character of the Homeric world of phenomena the idea 'invisible' really harmonizes with the following *λᾶαν γάρ μν̄ ἔθηκε.*" This proof appears to have lain entirely unnoticed in the corresponding passage of the Thirteenth Odyssey, where the Phaeacian galley is transformed to stone by the hand of Poseidon, as it runs into the harbor under the eyes of the people. The thought of the spectators in relation to the marvel is thus expressed (v. 168-9): *"Ω μοι, τίς δὴ νῆα θοὴν ἐπέδησ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ | οἴχασ' ἐλαυνομένην; καὶ δὴ προδραίνετο πᾶσα.* With *τίς, ἀθανάτων* may be supplied, as δ 380, since *πεδάω* is almost exclusively used of the action of deities. This tends to show their belief that some miracle has been wrought. The succeeding words of Alcinous, especially lines 177-8, point to some noticeable change in the appearance of the galley, and there exists throughout the episode a vague intimation that the transformed vessel shall supply the place of the threatened mountain, though still retaining a semblance to its former self. Now, the last clause of 169, *καὶ δὴ προδραίνετο πᾶσα*, "even now she was all plainly visible," surely implies the same contrast as is expressed in B by *ἀιγαλον* and *ἔφηνε* "she was just now in plain sight"; at the moment of speaking she was so no longer (cf. O 251, 496). Why? Not because she has been sunk by the hand of the god beneath the surface, for that contradicts the whole tenor of the recital. It must be interpreted, then, as declaring that the poet viewed such a transformation as producing invisibility. Cicero's language plainly tells us that he found a reason for this view of the poet in the supposition that the object transformed was conceived to be covered with a coating of stone, and thus concealed from sight. This is supported in a remarkable degree by the language of Sophocles in relation to Niobe, "whom a rocky growth like clinging ivy prisoned," *τὰν κισσὸς ὡς ἀτενῆς πετραία βλάστα δάμασεν*, Antig. 826, and *ἐν τάφῳ πετραίῳ*, Electra 151. Herein it may be said a certain plausibility is given to the marvel of 163. The exterior covering proceeding from the creative hand of the deity supplies the material for rooting the vessel firmly below. The illusion becomes all the stronger for plausibility.

A. C. MERRIAM.

THE WORD *WEASAND*.

An interesting discussion, begun by W. Hertzberg, and continued by Julius Zacher, relative to this word and its High-German next of kin, may be found in the *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*, X 383. The occasion for it was furnished by a false and ludicrous explanation of a passage in the Middle High-German poem of "Otto mit dem Barte," written by the famous mediaeval poet Konrad von Würzburg. There Heinrich von Kempten, after a struggle with the Emperor in which the latter's crown falls off and rolls upon the floor, seizes him by the throat, and drawing his dagger, proceeds to extort a recantation of the oath just sworn against his life. The courtiers are at first petrified with terror; then, summoning up their courage, they are about to rush forward to their master's assistance. At this point Von Kempten warns them back, threatening instant death to the Emperor if any one should be so hardy as to attempt his rescue, and adding

"ich stich im abe den weisen
mit disem mezzer veste."

Weise is explained by Konrad's editor as "orphanus, the costliest jewel in the imperial diadem, brought into Germany, so the story goes, by Duke Ernest, and absolutely unparalleled in value." According to this interpretation, the couplet above quoted would be prosaically rendered :

"With this knife I'll cut away the costliest jewel of his crown."

The absurdity of such pointless bravado is but too apparent. Hertzberg, bringing to bear no little ingenuity and learning, combats the received view, and suggests the relationship of *weisen* to the English *weasand*. This word he suspects may have something in common with *wheeze*, but he fails to demonstrate the connection. Zacher follows him, but, after exhausting his sources of information, confesses that the etymology of the word is still obscure. Recognizing a difficulty in the derivation from a problematical Anglo-Saxon *hweasan*, on account of the initial *h*, of which there is no trace in the Anglo-Saxon *wæsend*, *wasend*, he is fain to believe that *weisen* should be classed with O. H. G. *waso*, "cespes;" *wasal*, "pluvia;" *wisa*, "wiese;" but for these words again he is in want of a satisfactory etymon.

The present writer undertakes to carry on the discussion begun in the *Zeitschrift* with the hope of discovering the true etymology of the English *weasand*. Its Anglo-Saxon form is quoted by Lye, in his *Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum*, London, 1772, as *wæsend wasend*, with a reference to Ælfric's Glossary. In Haupt's *Zeitschrift*, IX 464, 490, we find *wasende*, "inglувie," and *wasend*, "inglувies" (glossed as "gula").

What relation does this unmistakable ancestor of *weasand* bear to the verb *wheeze* and others of that ilk?

Lye, followed by Benfey, in his *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* under Skr. *çvas*, and at second-hand by Fick in his *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch*, I 60, assigns to *hweosan* the meaning "wheeze, diffculter respirare," but furnishes no example of its actual use.

Kuhn, *Zeitschrift* XV 318 ff., collects a number of derivatives, related to the Skr. intensive *çavasti*, and appearing, after compensative lengthening of the root-vowel occasioned by loss of the reduplicating syllable, as Icel. *hvðsa*, "fessum anhelare," and, with umlaut from derivative *ja*, as *hvíðsa*, "graviter anhelare," Swed. *hwéðsa* "hiss" (as snakes), or "whistle" (as the wind); *hwéðande*, neuter, "a whistling, roaring, hissing." Cleasby and Vigfusson, *Icelandic-English Dictionary*, also have *hvíðsa*, "hiss."

Moreover, there is actual proof of the existence of the verb in Anglo-Saxon, not, however, as *hweosan*, which would be phonetically inconsistent with Icel. *hvðsa* and *hvíðsa*. In Ælfric's Homily on the Nativity of the Innocents, p. 92 of Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, occurs the preterite singular *hwéðs*, which, compared with the Norse forms adduced above, evidently belongs to March's Fifth Conjugation (Grammar, § 208), with the contracted preterites in *eo*. Whether the infinitive should be set down as *hwðsan* or *hwéðsan* admits of some doubt.

Sweet assumes the latter, but this would be the only instance of a verb in *æ* with contract preterite in *eo*, excepting the form *leot*, from *lætan*, *Sax. Chr.* 852.

On the contrary, verbs with radical vowel *a*, and preterite in *eo*, (Grimm's Third Conj.), exist in no inconsiderable number. As we have seen, the Icelandic verb has two forms, *hvðsa* and *hvíðsa*, and it will not be forgotten that *weasand* is represented in Anglo-Saxon by both *wðsend* and *wéðsend*, for there can be no doubt as to the length of the first syllable, and Leo, in his *Angelsächsisches Glossar.*, has already set the example of employing the accent over the radical vowel.

The identification of *hwéasan* (*hwásan*) with *wésend* (*wásend*)—for the latter word would originally have been the present participle of the verb from which it sprang (cf. *fiend* and *friend*)—depends upon the possibility of showing that aphaeresis of initial *h*, standing for Indo-European *k*, is not unknown in the Anglo-Saxon period, for the phenomenon is regular in O. H. G., and by no means exceptional in Old Norse. Wimmer, *Altnordische Grammatik*, § 24, C. e., says in relation to this point: “*H* ist selbst in sehr alten handschriften vor *l*, *n* und *r* oft ausgelassen (*lutr*=*hlutr*; *ringr*=*hringr* u. s. w.). Diess ist regel in norwegischen handschriften.”

A number of A. S. words occur in double form, i. e., both with and without initial *h*, that are excluded by the consideration that this *h* does not demonstrably correspond to the Aryan primal *k*. To the following, however, no exception can be taken on this score:

H before *l*:

Hliva (*clivus*) > *hlira* > *lira*. Cf. Fick VII 88. In Haupt, Gl. 478, occurs *spaerlirena*, “surarum;” 482, *spaerliran*, “suras;” 483, and *spaerlirum*, “et suris.” *Hluttor* (Fick, VII 90, Curtius, *Grundzüge*, 151) > *luttor*. In Haupt, Gl. 418, are the forms *hlyttor*, “luculentus, splendidus,” and *hluttor*, “clarus;” 468, *ahluttredes hunigteares*, “defecati nectaris;” 529, *fram hlutrum* *wine*, “a puro vino;” but 480, *luttres* *wines*, “defruti.”

H before *r*:

Hring (Fick, I 52; Curt. 151) > *ring*. Haupt, Gl. 405, *ehringa*, “pupillarum;” 406, *hofringas*, “orbes;” 434, *ringum*, “annulis;” 493, *ehringum*, “orbibus, oculis;” 514, *eahringum*. “oculorum orbibus;” 519, *hringum*, “spiris, nexibus.”

Hreów (Fick, I 53; Curt. 156) > *reów*. Beów. 548, *hreó wéron ydha*; Cri. 859, *hreóne hryeg*; but Jul. 481, *reóne stredm*; An. 1336, *hí wéron reówe*; Guth. 377, *wéron hí reówe*.

Hruh (Fick I 53) > *ruh*. This is probably only another spelling of the last word. With *h*, Haupt, Gl. 524, *hruhe*, “hirsutus;” without *h*, Gl. 482, *ruches*, “nodosi.”

So likewise *hreosendlic*; Haupt, Gl. 422, *hreosendlic*, “cassabundus, corruendus;” 459, *hreosendlice*, “cassabundum, corruendum;” but 499, *reosendlicum ræscum* (glossed as “scurum”), “ruituris imbribus.”

H before w:

The loss of *h* in this combination is precisely that which occurs in the supposed transition from *hwásan* to *wésend*. Here we have only one example, but that of an important word, namely, *hweorf* (*hweorfan*). Cf. Fick, III 542 and Curt., 353, 464. In Haupt, Gl. 458, *weorf-nyten* (glossed as "hors"), "subjugales." Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, p. 467, is disposed to connect A. S. *orf*, *yrfe* with Goth. *arbi*, but does not succeed in satisfying himself, and appears never to have seen the form *weorf*. So Morris and Skeat, Specimens of Early English, Part Second, Gloss. Index, s. v. *orf*. There can be little question that *weorf* is related to *hweorfan*, in the sense of to wander, perambulate, go, as Greek $\pi\sigma\beta\alpha\tau\alpha$ to $\pi\sigma\beta\alpha\iota\omega$. For the verb, cf. Ælf. Metra of Boethius, 24, 44, *Gif þu wyrfst on wege*, and the alliteration in Judith, 249. This phenomenon is admitted in the case of *hweorfan* and its derivatives for both Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon. Cf. Vetter, Zum Muspilli, p. 44; Rieger, Alt- und Angelsächsische Verskunst, p. 9, and Sievers' Heliand, line 4145, note.

So soon as it is allowed that forms with and without initial *h* did coexist in Anglo-Saxon, it is evident that a verb *wásan* < *hwásan* might have existed in Anglo-Saxon, or at least that *wésend*, (*wésend*) is likely to have sprung from the *hwásan* (*hwdsan*) deduced above. If, then, we once more compare the Swed. *hwásende*, though the latter be used for the effect rather than the instrument, we must be convinced that this hypothesis is the correct one.

It is not improbable that the word *wesil* = windpipe, with its South German relative, *waisel*, *wázel*, may exist in the familiar phrase "To wet one's whistle." If *wesil* is only another form of *whistle*, as is rendered likely by the occurrence of an Icel. verb *hvisla*, "whisper," without formative *t*, but with initial *h*, this fact may furnish collateral evidence for the derivation of *weasand* from A. S. *hwásan*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

VARIA.

I. Among the fragments of Korinna, in Bergk's collection, is one (No. 20) which that scholar has dealt with in the most capricious way, making it almost unintelligible. It reads thus in his edition :

*Κλίτα γέροντ' ἀεισομένα
Ταναγρίδεσσι λευκοπέπλους·
μέγα δ' ἐμῆς γέγασε πόλις
λιγουροκωτίλης ἐνόπης.*

To obtain this text he has substituted *κλίτα* for *χαλά*, *γέροντ'* for *γέροια*, *ἀεισομένα* for *εἰσομένα*, *λευκοπέπλους* (with Ahrens) for *λευκοπέπλοις*, *ἐμῆς* (with Boeckh) for *ἐμή*, *γέγασε* for *γέγαθε* and *ἐνόπης* (with Boeckh) for *ἐνοπῆς*. One wonders that he did not throw away the old fragment and write a new verse altogether. He might then have made it intelligible and filled it with Ahrenian forms to his heart's content. The only real difficulty in the whole passage lies in the second word, which conjecture has read variously, *γέροια*, *γέρεια*, *γερῆι*, *Φέρωι*, *γέροντ'*. Why it should have been assumed to be a noun is not plain, especially as the *δέ* in the second clause almost implies a verb in the first. The true reading seems to have been *γέραιρ'* *ἀεισομέναν*, which being falsely divided, *γέραιρα* *εἰσομέναν*, became unintelligible, and caused the further alterations. Dropping most of Bergk's conjectures, we may read :

*Καὶτα γέραιρ' ἀεισομέναν
Ταναγρίδεσσι λευκοπέπλοις,
μέγα δ' ἐμή γέγαθε πόλι
λιγουροκωτίλης ἐνοπῆς.*

Here *ν* has been added to *ἀεισομέναν* and *ς* dropped from *πόλις*.

Might not the youthful Korinna, at the close of an ode, have bespoken the good graces of her hearers thus ?

“ Honor the future sweet singer of the white-robed dames of Tanagra, and rejoice, my city, in the clear-plaintive strain.”

It is worth while remarking that this passage proves the second *α* in *Táναγρα*, usually given as long, to have been naturally short.

II. In Aristotle's Metaphysics, *A* 7, p. 1072, b 2 (Bekk.) is a passage which has puzzled all the editors, and which yet may be emended with such ease and certainty that one wonders that its

true form should not have struck every one. Speaking of final cause, A. says: *ὅτι δὲ ἔστι τὸ οὖν ἔνεκα ἐν τοῖς ἀκινήτοις, ἡ διαιρεσίς δηλοῖ. ἔστι γάρ τινι τὸ οὖν ἔνεκα, ὅν τὸ μὲν ἔστι τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι.* In the last clause the *ῶν* evidently has no antecedent; consequently Schwegler proposes to substitute *διττόν* for *τινι* so as to make the antecedent clause equivalent to *ἔστι γάρ δίον γένη τῷ οὖν ἔνεκα*, which might then be followed by *ῶν*. For this change he has the support of two passages, *De Anima*, II 2, p. 415, b 2 sq., *τὸ δὲ οὖν ἔνεκα διττόν, τὸ μὲν οὖν, τὸ δὲ ϕ*, and *ibid.* b 20, *διττῶς δὲ τὸ οὖν ἔνεκα, τό τε οὖν καὶ τὸ ϕ*. Cf. *Physica*, II 2, p. 194, a 35. Bonitz, accordingly, approves of Schwegler's reading, although differing with him as to the interpretation of the passage. Nevertheless, the violent change of *τινι* into *διττόν* is not necessary, and the same meaning may be obtained and the sentence rendered grammatical in a much simpler way. The Laurentian MS. Ab, which Bonitz, as well as Bekker and Brandis, considers of the highest authority (vid. Preface to Bonitz's *Metaphysica*, p. xv), reads *ἔστι γάρ τινι τὸ οὖν ἔνεκα τινός ὡν, οὐ καὶ τὸ λ.* If after *ἔνεκα* we insert *καὶ*, which the scribe omitted, no doubt on account of the final *καὶ* of *ἔνεκα*, we obtain *ἔστι γάρ τινι τὸ οὖν ἔνεκα καὶ τινός, ὡν, οὐ καὶ τὸ λ.*, which is plain, intelligible, and good Aristotelian doctrine. The last clause, *ῶν τὸ μὲν ἔστι, τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι*, Bonitz completes by supplying *ἐν τοῖς ἀκινήτοις*. Abrupt and elliptical as Aristotle's Greek often is, I do not think he ever allows himself any such liberty as this. Nor do I think that by this means we obtain the sense he means to convey. The clause does not seem to me elliptical at all. Aristotle simply says: There are two kinds of final cause, the person or thing for whose sake anything is done, and the object aimed at in doing it. When a physician administers medicine, he does so for the sake of the patient (*τινί*), who *is*, and with a view to health, which *is not*, that is, is not *ἔνεργεια*, although it certainly is *δυνάμει*. But things that have any *δύναμις* are not *ἀκίνητα*, which is just what Aristotle means.

III. Pausanias, in his *Itinerary*, I 26, 5 (6), speaking of the Erechtheion, says: *Γραφαὶ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τοίχων τοῦ γένους εἰσὶ τῶν Βουταδῶν. καὶ, διπλοῦν γάρ ἔστι τὸ οἰχημα καὶ ὅδωρ ἔστιν ἔνδον θαλάσσιον ἐν φρέατι.* So the old editions read. Siebelis, Dindorf, and Schubert, not knowing what to do with the second *καὶ* before *ὅδωρ*, simply throw it out. Michaelis, who has a wild theory with respect to the Erechtheion to support in defiance of evidence, would read *καὶ—διπλοῦν γάρ ἔστι τὸ οἰχημα—καταβάσιν εἰς τὸ κάτω οἰχημα*

καὶ ὅδωρ ἔστιν ἔνδον ἐν φρέατι (then counting the next four lines a parenthesis) καὶ τριτῆς ἔστιν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ σχῆμα, which, without accounting for the troublesome καὶ (why should he say "Both water and the mark of the trident"), entails a new difficulty in the last ἔστιν. The more cautious Jahn assumes a lacuna after *οἰχημα* without attempting to fill it. Now, it seems to me, there cannot be any doubt what the missing word was. Herodotus, VIII 55, tells us: *"Ἔστι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ταύτῃ Ἐρεχθίος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου εἶναι νῆσος ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῃ τε καὶ θαλάσσα ἐνι.* And we know, from other sources, that the sacred olive was the most important object in the Erechtheion, as being the proof of Athena's title to the temple and the citadel. It is, therefore, almost incredible that Pausanias should have mentioned the salt-water tank and left the more important sacred olive unnoticed, so that we should be justified in inserting the word *ἐλαίᾳ* before the second καὶ. The sentence would then read: *Γραφαὶ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τοίχων τοῦ γένους εἰσὶ τῶν Βουταδῶν, καὶ ἐλαίᾳ—διπλοῦν γάρ ἔστι τὸ οἰχημα—καὶ ὅδωρ ἔστιν ἔνδον θαλάσσαν ἐν φρέατι.* This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that when further on (27, 2) he speaks of the olive, he alludes to it as if he had already mentioned it: *Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐλαίας οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν ἄλλο εἰπεῖν κ. τ. λ.* There is great hesitancy among archaeologists to admit that the olive was within the *ναός*; but there ought to be no doubt on the matter.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A Sanskrit Grammar, including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana. By WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College, New Haven. For sale by B. Westermann & Co., New York. Price \$3.70.

We have received from the publishers, Messrs. Breitkopf and Härtel of Leipsic, a copy of Professor Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar. It is the first of a series of Indo-European grammars which this house is now issuing. This volume appears in English, and also in a German translation by Dr. Heinrich Zimmer.

The name of the author is a sufficient voucher for the character of the book. Unlike most of its predecessors, it is based upon thorough-going investigations of the actual facts and usages of the language as seen in the most important documents of its extant literature. It includes "both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana." This promise of the title-page suggests one of the most distinctive features of the work. It is an historical grammar from beginning to end. Multitudes of the facts of the classical language, as stated in the ordinary treatises, appear excessively arbitrary and artificial; but when presented as they are here, in the light of the older language, they appear reasonable and natural. Dead as the Sanskrit itself may be, this volume everywhere makes the *study of Sanskrit* now a study of *life and growth*.

The use of different sizes of type enables the beginner to select easily those portions a knowledge of which is needed at the outset. The Sanskrit words are transliterated throughout; and are given in the original characters also, where this was practicable (in the paragraphs set in the largest type and leaded).

To all students of Sanskrit, and no less to classical teachers who desire to get from that language what help they can for making their work intelligent and effective, Mr. Whitney's grammar is worthy of unqualified commendation. The lack of suitable type precludes our giving in this number such a detailed notice of the

work as it deserves; but we were unwilling to neglect this, the earliest opportunity, to call attention to it. May its appearance mark the beginning of a new epoch in linguistic studies for our native land!

C. R. L.

A Study of the Hexameter of Virgil, and a Study of the Principal Latin Rhythms other than the Hexameter. By JOSEPH W. CLOUGH. Boston, 1879.

The author attempts to show that Latin poetry was recited exclusively according to accent, and attributes to each accented syllable two *tempora* and to each unaccented syllable one *tempus*, thus admitting quantity as an element after all. And still he believes that each verse was composed *conventionally* with a certain quantitative *metrum*; that, for instance, the hexameter had to have its six feet, four of which were dactyls or spondees, the fifth usually a dactyl and the sixth a spondee (or trochee). But this *metrum* was entirely disregarded in reciting. Vergil, he says, wrote "with the fear of the quantities before his eyes," yet he neither tells us the origin of this conventional usage, nor does he inform us what the quantity of the *metrum* really was; and it is difficult to see what it could have been, inasmuch as in the "rhythm" (by which term he designates the true reading "*cantatio*, not *lectio*," of verse) the accented syllables were long and the unaccented short. Moreover, in each kind of verse there was a fixed number of accents and a fixed number of *tempora*. In the hexameter the accents were *five* and the *tempora twenty-four*. The ordinary minimum verse, having thirteen syllables, gives us $8+2 \times 5 = 18$ *tempora*, and the maximum, seventeen syllables, gives $12+2 \times 5 = 22$. The other *tempora* of the twenty-four were made up by pauses. This system compels us sometimes to make a pause at the end of every word, and sometimes to place two accents on one word, and sometimes to group several words together under one accent; and that, too, although the author himself says that Quintilian assigns the accent a fixed position, and that "we have eminent authority for the fact that each word . . . had but one accent." (This "authority" should have been named, so that we might judge for ourselves of his "eminence." It was a certain M. Tullius Cicero.) He even treats Greek verse in the same manner, *applying the Latin system of accentuation*. Of

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

A Hand-Book to Modern Greek. By EDGAR VINCENT, Coldstream Guards, and T. G. DICKSON. With a Preface by Prof. BLACKIE. London, Macmillan & Co., 1879. 16mo, xvi 273. (Cushings & Bailey, Baltimore. \$1.25.)

When we say that this is the best work on modern Greek that has hitherto appeared in the English language, we are not giving it very high praise, or naming any test by which its merits can be appreciated. There does not indeed exist, in any language, a really good book on modern Greek, and to this general statement the present work forms no marked exception. The great demerit of them all is, that they do not emphasize or make important in practice, the fact that modern Greek is not a language, but three dialects merging into each other more or less imperceptibly. There is, first, the *χυδαία* or vulgar Romaic, the language of the common people, the language of the Klephtic ballads, and, indeed, the only form of Greek in which poetry, properly so-called, can be written. Next, there is the *χαθυριλλουμένη*, or speech of the middle classes, very fairly represented in the present volume by the extracts from the *Οἰκογένεια καὶ Σχηματική* of Angelos Vlachos (*Βλάχος*), pp. 221-31. It is a sort of reformed Romaic, suited to the purposes of cultivated life. Lastly there is the *χαθαρένουσα*, or jumble

of Romaic and ancient Greek forms and French idioms, a non-descript and artificial dialect in which most of the Greeks write, but which hardly anybody, except a few professors at the university, speaks. The present work is, for the most part, a hand-book of this last strange dialect, occasionally, indeed, taking up forms and idioms belonging to the other two, but nowhere carefully distinguishing them. This, of course, leads only to confusion. What can a person think, when he finds, e. g., *he told him*, expressed, sometimes by $\tauὸν εἶπε$, sometimes by $\tauὸν εἶπε$, and sometimes by $\tauῷ εἶπε$? All three are, indeed, in use in Greece, but under different circumstances. The Grammar (Part I), which occupies 120 pages, is concise and not very incorrect. It is strange, however, to be told that Turkish nouns have no dative, without being told at the same time the reason, viz., that they are not used in the *καθαρεύουσα*, which alone has a dative. It is also surprising to a person who speaks Greek to find the acc. plur. of *καφές* given as *καφέδας* (p. 32), a form which nobody uses. Indeed, the authors must have found, on trial, that *they* could not use it; for on page 34, last example, we read $\delta\;οὐκοδεσπότης\;է\;ցյդցէ\;ծնօ\;խափէծէ\;ς$, which is correct. The Grammar is full of such little inaccuracies, with here and there some glaringly large ones, as, e. g., where we are told, p. 113, that "The adjective stands before the substantive, with which it agrees, except when the two together form the Predicate" (cf. *նվշտաց ծլօչկիրուս*, p. 240), or that "The Second Singular Imperative [of the Second Aor.] is accented on the last syllable," which is true in only five cases at most. Nobody says *քոյէ*, *μանէ*, etc. When we are informed that "Modern Greek has retained both the First and Second Aorist (*sic*), but in no one verb are both forms in use," we can easily disprove the latter statement from the work itself, e. g., on p. 97, the Aor. of *τρέχω* is given as *էթրէչա*, and yet, on p. 83, we find *էթէծրամու*.

Part II, which consists of dialogues and letters, must prove very useful to the student, although the language is such as one rarely hears spoken. Part III, consisting of Passages from Ancient Greek Authors, with translations into Modern Greek, might have been omitted with advantage, and Part IV, containing Selections from Contemporary Greek Writers, made to cover its space. The Vocabulary (Part V) is rendered difficult to use from being arranged under subjects, instead of alphabetically.

In spite, however, of all these drawbacks, and very numerous misprints, this little work cannot fail to be of great use to persons

about to visit Greece, or to take up the study of modern Greek. We ought to add that the authors, though evidently not profound scholars, are as evidently capable of writing a much better book than they have written. Let us hope they will do so, and soon.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

De Alcestidis et Hippolyti Euripidearum Interpolationibus. Disputationis de Interpolatione Euripidea Specimen, etc. J. H. WHEELER (Diss.). Bonnae, 1879.

In this dissertation Dr. Wheeler has evinced a knowledge of his author such as few possess who for the first time undertake the fascinating but perilous exploration of the text of Euripides. It is indeed a dangerous quest; for while all are agreed that the ordinary resources of diplomatic criticism will not suffice to restore the image of the poet's art, still so much depends on the critic's conception of Euripides that many will be found to say, as Dr. Wheeler himself confesses, that the objections lie not against the interpolations but against the poet. The investigator has to encounter at every turn the inevitable circle of arguing from the poet to his work and from the work to the poet. If we reject inconsistencies, repetitions, long-winded declamations, blurs and blotches, because they are not Euripidean, we are in danger of setting up an Euripides of our own, who by means of gradual elimination will cease to bear a recognizable resemblance to the portrait by Aristophanes, which, with all its exaggerations and distortions, is an unmistakable likeness to the original, and this restored Euripides will make it harder for us to accept minor inconsistencies, briefer repetitions, minuter specks, until we arrive at the condition which Hermann so pointedly states in his preface to the *Phoenissae*: *Qui laudis illius adipiscendae gratia de industria suspiciones venatur, in eo ista obelis ostentandae perspicaciae cupiditas postremo in morbum vertit, ipsi quidem qui eo morbo tenetur gratum, aliis autem molestissimum et paene intolerabilem.* But this warning is clearly a note of the old school. Euripidean criticism has, during the last two decades, gone far beyond the old limit, and in the search for truth men cannot be stopped by suspicion of their suspicions. Certainly, in Dr. Wheeler's case, the masculine honesty of his purpose adds a special charm to his learning and insight. It is not surprising that, in his familiarity with Euripides, he should at times rest his *athetesis* on grounds which might

seem almost entirely subjective. True, while he is evidently an ardent admirer of Euripides, as is natural, he is not a thorough-paced encomiast, as he has shown by his strictures on the Alkestis, and he admits freely the weaknesses of his hero. But for all that he is intolerant of much that less fastidious critics would pass by, and can lay claim to the *animus suspicax* which Bentley demands for the guild, and in his eyes "he is more in fault who darkens the poet's good name by defending one spurious verse than he who deprives the poet of two good and genuine verses."

As a specimen of his Euripidean work, Dr. Wheeler has taken two of the earlier pieces, the Alkestis and the Hippolytos, because their build is clearer, and any interference by the interpolator with the natural development would be more evident than in the later poems. A detailed statement of the changes which Dr. Wheeler proposes, prepared for this number of the Journal, is necessarily omitted for want of room. Especially important is the hint which the author gives of the evidence which he has gathered that Euripidean interpolations are due in some measure to inserting trimeters in order to make up for cutting choral passages ; and the use which he makes of the *Ιππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος* in reconstructing passages of our Hippolytos is ingenious and interesting. Everywhere Dr. Wheeler has the courage of his opinions, and in one place he does not hesitate to pronounce a passage much admired by Valckenaer nothing but a spurious piece of patch-work ; and this thorough honesty of conviction, which I have emphasized before, is much needed in the work of American philologists, to whose ranks Dr. Wheeler is a valuable accession.

B. L. G.

Selections from the Greek Lyric Poets, with an Historical Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By HENRY M. TYLER, Professor of Greek and Latin in Smith College, Northampton, Mass. Boston, Ginn & Heath, 1879.

Based on Buchholz's well-known Anthologie. With what care and knowledge the work has been done may be seen from the following samples of the commentary, culled from the first few pages. Kallinos 1, 1 (the very first note), "μέχρις : The form is epic though not used in Homer." As it happens, the parallel passage cited by the commentators is Il. 24, 128 : τέο μέχρις ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχείων. Homer uses the word only twice, once as above, once in the form

μέχρι, Il. 13, 143. V. 13, “εἰ: used by the poets, where Attic prose would use ἀν.” To say nothing of the loose form of the note, why ἀν instead of ἡν? So just afterward, v. 17, the note has ἀν τι πάθη, the text ἡν. On Tyrtaios, 10, 25, it was surely unnecessary to call the attention of the pupils of Smith College to the antique candor of *αἰδοῖα*. Solon, 4, 6 “πειθόμενοι: suggests the idea of yielding to persuasion,” very much as *μεγάλην* (v. 3) suggests the idea of “great.” The crown of scholarship, however, is to be found in the annotation on Mimnermos, 2, 14, “Ἄιδην: the use of the *feminine* form, as referring to a place, belongs to the later Greek.” This discovery is Professor Tyler’s own. But then he has had peculiar advantages. This extension of Comte’s saying, this great revelation *l’enfer se féminise* could only have been made by a teacher of exceptional opportunities. Das Ewig-Weibliche zieht uns hinan.

B. L. G.

The Frisian Language and Literature: A Historical Study. By W. T. HEWETT.

This is an excellent monograph, not only on the language and literature of the Frisians, but also on their history. The first part, “on the early extent of Frisia,” is particularly valuable because it puts in a convenient shape and place all the references to the subject in the classical and later writers. The amount of the extant literature is, while succinct, yet complete and accurate.

The “brief review of Frisian forms and inflections” is still based on Heyne, Rask and Helfenstein. We think the author should have gone beyond them, especially in the phonology. The late researches have shown that the predominance of the primitive vowels a, i, u, in Frisian, as in Gothic, is not so great and striking as the above authorities think it to be.

H. C. G. B.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, DE LITTÉRATURE ET D' HISTOIRE ANCIENNES. (Edited by ÉD. TOURNIER, L. HAVET AND CH. GRAUX: Paris.) 1877. Vol. I. (New Series.)¹.

1. pp. 7-24. The importance of a knowledge of epigraphy in interpreting certain classic works (A letter to L. Havet from E. Desjardins). This letter discusses the fourth Silva of the First Book of Statius, and criticises translations of this work, taking that of Rinn (one of the best) as a sample, and points out various errors which would have been avoided by a thorough knowledge of the Roman *cursus honorum*, and of certain inscriptions. The article throws much light on the history of the hero of this Silva, C. Rutilius Gallicus. [The article exhibits acute critical powers and is clear and methodical. At one point, where the opinion is expressed that *gemini*, *geminati*, denote simultaneous *doubling* rather than *succession*, we miss an allusion to an exception in "*tergeminis honoribus*," especially as these very *honores* are the subject under discussion.]

2. pp. 189-192. Second letter to Havet from Desjardins on the same subject. Making use of an inscription (Vol. VI, p. 444, of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*), the author establishes some further details, especially in the *cursus honorum* of C. Rutilius Gallicus, showing also the date of his death to have been A. D. 92—the very year to which his death had been assigned by combination in the previous letter.

3. pp. 25-34. The Epitaph of the Athenians slain at Chaeronea, cited in the *De Corona* § 289 (By Henri Weil). A defence of the authenticity of the Epitaph, showing that the passage formerly attributed to Gaetulicus, but shown by Kaibel to be much earlier (and hence believed to be the genuine Epitaph), cannot be the true Epitaph of the Athenians; and producing strong arguments in defence of the one cited in Demosthenes, which the author amends as follows: v. 1, he changes *ἐνεκα* to *μὲν ἐκάς*; v. 3, *ἀρετῆς* to *ἀρεως*; v. 5, *ζυγὸν αὐχένι θέντες* to *ζυγῷ αὐχένα δέντες*; v. 10, *ἐν βιοτῷ . . . φυγεῖν* to *αἰχμητῷ . . . φυγάν*. [If the MSS. gave the form to which Weil reduces the Epitaph no one would doubt its authenticity; but the changes are unpleasantly numerous and a little violent.]

4. pp. 35-39. Attic Orthography according to Inscriptions (By Paul Foucart). *a)* *Τίος* and *γνός*, according to the grammarian Theognostus, were spelled *ἴος*, *γνός*, at Athens. For *ἴος* his statement is verified by numerous inscriptions, the forms found being *ἴος*, *ἴον*, *ἴόν*; *ἴεις*, *ἴεν*, *ἴεις*. The Inscriptions run from B. C. 409 down to the Roman conquest, when *ἴος* begins to appear. *b)* *θάλασσα* vs. *θάλαττα*: the latter (-ττ-) is the only form found in (seven) inscriptions, B. C. 425-324. So *τέτταρες*, *τετταράκοντα*. *c)* *Ἴν* and *ἄν*

¹In the case of the *Revue de Philologie*, as in the case of other journals of recent establishment, it has been thought best to begin with the beginning for the sake of completeness.—ED.

(for *ξάν*) are never found in Attic inscriptions. *d*) So *λυρούργια* or *λυτούργια* (not *λεττ-*) in (three) inscriptions before our era (supported also by authority of grammarians). *e*) *Κωλαγρέται* should be *κωλακρέται* (Corp. Inscr. Att. 20, 37, 45, 93, 285). *f*) No inscription gives *έρσηφορεῖν*, one of late date gives *άρρηφορεῖν*, while the common form is *έρρηφορεῖν*. *g*) *Φλέσσωι*, not *Φλάσσωι*, is found. *h*) Thuc. v. 18; *Σκῶλος*, correct *Στῶλος*; *Σιγγαίονς*, corr. *Σιγγίονς* or *Σινγίονς*, *Στάγειρος* and *Στάγιφος* not found in inscriptions, but only *Σταγιρῖται*.

5. pp. 40-54 and 284-261. *Emendationes ad T. Livium* (By A. Harant). Some forty conjectures, many of which are quite convincing.

6. pp. 55-85. Coricius, Eulogy of Aratius and Stephanus; published for the first time from the MS. (N-101) in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid (By Ch. Graux). Aratius, a distinguished subordinate of Belisarius, was, at the time of the oration, Dux Palaestinae, while Stephanus was civil governor (*consularis*) of Palestine. The oration throws some light on certain obscure portions of history, and presents some facts entirely new; but the allusions are for the most part vague, the oration being addressed to Aratius and Stephanus personally (at Gaza) and all others present being presumed to know the facts to which allusion is made. (The editor, Ch. Graux, has added valuable critical notes, and gives an interesting discussion of what is meant by *διαλέξεις*.)

7. p. 85. Restoration of a passage of Epicurus (By J. Lachelier). The passage, cited by Diogenes Laertius, 10, 142, is to be read: . . . *ἔτι τε τὸ μὴ κατανοεῖν τοῦς δροὺς κτλ.* On p. 200 Lachelier again briefly discusses the same passage.

8. pp. 86-90. Observations on certain passages of Cicero de Officiis (By Ch. Thurot). Discusses Cicero's Latin equivalents for the Stoic *σωφροσύνη*, and its subdivisions, *εὐταξία* (*ordo*), *κοσμιότης* (*ornatus*), *αἰδώς* (*verecundia*), etc., etc. Cicero himself confesses (35, 126) that the Greek words are *difficiles ad eloquendum*.

9. pp. 91-100 (fine print). Obituary notice of F. Ritschl, with an account of his Life and Labors (By E. Benoist).

10. pp. 101-165. Critical study of the Letters of Seneca to Lucilius (By Émile Chatelain). Discussion of the MSS. of the first thirteen books (p, P, and *Paris. b*); criticism of previous collations. Discussion of some fifty passages, with various conjectures. Complete collation of *p* (*Paris. Bibl. Nat. No. 8540*) and partial collations of *P* and *Paris. b*. Then follow observations on the errors of *p*, such as one consonant for two and *vice versa*, *h* added or omitted, *ae* for *e*, *oe* for *e*, *a* for *e*, *a* for *o*, *a* for *au*, *o* for *a*, *a* for *u*, *u* for *a*, *e* for *a*, *e* for *o*, *o* for *e*, *e* for *u*, *e* for *it*, *i* for *e*, *i* for *u* or *ii*, *i* for *t*, *t* for *i*, *u* for *b*, *u* for *i*, *u* for *o*, *ur* added, *us* added or omitted. The letter *c* appears to have been dropped about loose, sometimes falling between words, as *itura c ratio*, sometimes in the middle of words, as *credidicmus*. Further *c* is used for *qu*, *qu* for *c*, *c* for *g*, *g* for *c*, *c* for *t*, *t* for *c*, *c* for *x*, *x* for *c*, *d* for *t*, *t* for *d*. Then we have substitution of words that bear a resemblance, as *amicos* for *animos*, and finally assimilation *a* of a word to one preceding it, as *aliquam faciam* (for *faciem*); *b* more frequently of a word to one following it, as *opinioni damni* for *opinionem damni*. [The author's surprise at this last is without good cause.] All the examples of these errors are printed in columns. The author discusses, further, arbitrary corrections by copyists, and closes with a note on two Vatican MSS. (2207 and 1454).

11. pp. 165-7. *Varia* (By L. Haret). Discussion (with conjectures) of passages of Statius, Commodianus, Luctatii Placidi *glossae*, Apuleius, Pacuvius. [Some of the conjectures are quite satisfying.]

12. pp. 168-181. On the Authenticity of the Law of Euagoras cited in Demosthenes against Meidias § 10 (By Paul Foucart). The authenticity of such pieces is not to be discussed in a general way, but each must be examined to itself; whereby we find that some are mere inventions, some are modifications, and some, exact quotations. The passage in question, if genuine, is one of importance because of the light it sheds on some of the Athenian Festivals. The arguments of Westermann, who pronounces the Law spurious, are taken up in detail and ably confuted. The most important point is to show that the Dionysia of the Piraeus was not a Festival *κατ' ἄγροις* (as Westermann maintains), but was a city Festival; and this the author does by sound arguments based on inscriptions. The words *καὶ οἱ παιδεῖς καὶ ὁ κόμος* receive a striking explanation.

13. pp. 182-188. Scholia on Thucydides (Published by L. Duchesne; furnished by Ιω. Σακκελίων). Taken from a MS. of Patmos of the tenth century. These Scholia are of some value; for instance, in Thuc. vi 74: ἀπελθόντες ἐς Νάξον καὶ Θράκας (*sic*, Bekker), σταυρώματα περὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον ποιησάμενοι αὐτοῦ δειχείματον, the words *καὶ Θράκας* make nonsense; and yet no principle of criticism justifies their suppression. Now the MS. of Patmos gives *ὅρα* *καὶ* for *Θράκας* and, explains *ὅρα* as "fortified places, now called *ὅρα*," which word (*ὅρουν*) Hesychius defines *τείχισμα, φραγμόν*. It is evident that *ΟΠΑΚΑΙ* (*ὅρα* being a *ἅταξ εἰρημένον*, was mistaken for *ΘΡΑΚΑΣ*).

14. pp. 193-204. Critical Notes (By various authors). a) By Henri Weil: Conjectures on Eur. Tro. 477 sq., 587 sq., 531 sq., 1187, 383 sq. Herod. VII 161: for *οὐκ ὄνειδος* read *οὐκ ἀεικές*. Dion Chrysost., Vol. II, p. 433 (Reiske): for *παχείας* read *παγχρύσους*. Ausonius, Epist. X 47: for *non Poena* read *non προίκα*. b) By J. Lachelier: Sextus Empiricus, p. 246, 17 (Bekker): for *οὐκ εἰχε δὲ αὐτὴν* read *οὐκ εἴκε δὲ αὐτῇ*. c) By Max Bonnet: Stobaeus, Florilegium, 40, 7: the quotation (assigned to Democritus) broken up and changed into two iambic trimeters, and assigned to Euripides. Hor. Epist. I 17, 31: for *chlamydem* read *chlanidem*. d) By Éd. Tournier: Conjectures on Herod. I 89; 108; II 141; III 14 (bis); 79; VII 101. Babrius v. 15-16: read *οἴμον Αἰσθόν* *μίνθοις φράσαντος*. Epicurus (Diog. Laert., X 132): read *διδάσκοντα* or *διδάσκοντα γ'* instead of *διδάσκοντα*. Aesch. Pers., 189: for *μαθόν* read *μολών*. e) By H. Dulac: Lucian, Dial. Deor. XXI 2, read *αὐτῷ τῷ κεραυνῷ* [*καὶ βροντῇ*].

15. pp. 204-205. Quos ego (By Ch. Thurot). These words (as is shown by examples from Cicero) are equivalent to "Illos quidem ego" (i. e., the rel. followed by *ego* implies a concession which introduces an objection).

16. pp. 206-8. Palaeographic Notes (By Ch. Graux). a) Xen. Mem., I Prooem. 3, 7: *πολλοῖς* (*vulg. πολλοῖς*) *δειπνίζονταν* found in MS. No. 1302, Paris. This is one of the best MSS.: imperfectly collated by Dübner. b) Montfaucon, Palaeogr. Graec. pp. 43 and 257, mistakes for *Διόδορος* a sort of monogram of 'Ιωάννης *διώρθωτος* or *διώρθωτεν*, in MS. No. 2179, Paris. c) Some points with regard to the age of *bombycinī*. The Greek MS. No. 990, Paris, is *not* a *bombycinus* but a *membranaceus*; while Gr. MS. 154 is of the thirteenth century (not as old as has been supposed). d) Note on the Escorialensis Φ-III-8 of Philostratus, Apollon.

Tyzen. Collation of three passages, showing the proper place of this MS. among the others (of this work). *e*) In the monastery of San Lorenzo del Escorial, among other relics, is a MS. "that once belonged to St. John Chrysostom." It has these words written on it *prima manu*: *κτῆμα τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου Χρυσοστόμου!* It is a book of Evangelists, written in uncial letters in the eighth or ninth century, with accents and musical notes; but the question is, how John Chrysostom came to be canonized before his death.

17. p. 208. A fragment of Hyperides: *πάντων ἀπαιδευτάτων τὸ λοιδορεῖν* (cited by Dion. Antioch.).

18. pp. 209-247. Choricius, Apology of the Mimes, published for the first time from the MS. (N—101) of the Bibl. Nacional de Madrid (By Ch. Graux). This oration gives some new details in regard to the history of the Theatre in the times of Justinian, as well as some fragments, partly new, of various authors. Valuable critical notes are added. [The oration is ingenious enough, but in places ridiculous, as where, having called attention to the fact that the gods on various occasions assumed the forms of men, etc., he asks indignantly: *θεῶν οὖν μυμομένων, τίνα τρόπον ἀνθρώποις ἔγκλημα γίνεται μίμησις;*]

19. p. 247. Parody in Aristophanes (By Éd. Tournier). Calls attention to the excellent work of W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *De parodia in comoediss Aristophanis*, and asks whether *Wasps*, 1031 seq., is not a parody on the description of Scylla in the *Odyssey*.

20. pp. 248-253. Correction of Hor. Od. III 14, 12 (By L. Quicherat), *iam virum expertae male ominatis* into *male inominatis*. Some MSS. give *nomi-natis*, which points to the rare word *inominatis*, found only in one other place, and that, too, in *Horace* (Epop. 16, 38): *inominati perprimat cubilia*.

21. p. 253. A brief Note (by Éd. Tournier) showing that *πλεῖων* in some passages means "in addition," "besides"; as Thuc. I 36. In Soph. Phil., 576, and in Oed. Col. 36, it *must* be so interpreted.

22. p. 261. Note (by Tournier) on Plutarch, *De exsil.*, pp. 600-601: putting *τὴν* before *ἐν Αθῆναις*, and changing *βελτίονα* into *καλλίονα*.

23. pp. 262-3. Notes on Greek grammar (By Ch. Graux). *a*) Nouns in *-εῖς* had nom. pl. *ῆς* till about 380. The word *ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΕΣ* in a decree of 446-5 is to be read *Χαλκιδεῆς* and not *Χαλκιδέες*. *b*) Fem. Dual: the author removes some obstacles to the view that the fem. dual sometimes had a form distinct from the masc.

24. pp. 264-6. The gods of Epicurus (By J. Lachelier). A discussion of the physical nature of the gods, based on the *De Natura Deorum*. The atomic theory plays an important part in the discussion.

25. pp. 267-288. Notes on various ancient authors (By several persons). Critical discussion of passages in Aeschylus, Demosthenes, Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, Antipater (Anth. Pal.), Longus, Caesar, Pliny (Nat. Hist.), Vitruvius, Arnobius (observations on the MSS. of Optatianus); Vegetius. [Some of these notes are interesting and important.]

The REVUE DES REVUES, appended to the REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE and exceeding it in volume, gives, in the most condensed form, the substance of all important classical articles in Reviews, Transactions of Societies, etc., published in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece,

Holland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United States. For each country there is an *editor-general*, who employs others to assist him when necessary; and M. CHARLES GRAUX is *editor-in-chief*.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE. Vol. II, 1878.

1. pp. 1-10. Relations of Linguistic Science to Philology (Letter to Éd. Tournier from Michel Bréal). The author denies that these two branches of knowledge are entirely distinct, and in order to show how much Philology owes to Linguistic Science, he mentions some of the absurd etymologies proposed by scholars before the new science removed the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, and employs other strong arguments.

2. pp. 11-14. Choriciana (Letter to Ch. Graux from Th. Gomperz). Discusses a dozen passages in the works of Choricius published by Graux in the *Revue de Philologie* (1877), making several conjectures. One point may be mentioned. In the *Apology of the Mimes*, XVIII 2, we read: *φασὶ τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡς ἀγωνίζομαι τέχνην, ἐξ οὐ πάντα φησὶν ἀπαγγέλλειν δὲ προσηγορίᾳ μὲν δεύτερος τὴν τάξεν δὲ πρώτος, ἐκεῖνον (Philemon) δὴ λέγονται καὶ τὸν παῖδα τὸν Διοπείθοντος (Menander) ἡλικιώτας τ' ἀμφο τέ. Graux had invited Philologists to explain the clause *ἐξ οὐ πρώτος*. Gomperz suggests as the most plausible explanation, that *δεύτερος* refers to *Secundus*, author of four extant Epigrams, who was probably a contemporary of Choricius. [This interpretation, I may say, occurred to me also the first time I read the sentence.]*

To this article Graux adds, among other things, a note from Prof. Ussing: According to Choricius (*Apol. Mim.*, IX 3), Smicrines, the Miser of Menander, feared *μή τι τῶν ἔνδον ὁ καπνὸς οἰχοίτο φέρων*, which is exactly what is said of the Miser of Plautus (*Aulularia*, v. 300):

Quin divom atque hominum clamat continuo fidem,
Suam rem perisse seque eradicarier
De suo tigillo fumus si qua exit foras.

Tigillum here is not the log on the fire, but the beam on which hams, etc., were hung to be smoked.

3. pp. 15-18. Appius Claudius and Spurius Carvilius (By L. Havet). Discusses the expulsion of Z from the old Latin Alphabet by Appius Claudius, and the substitution for it of G, invented by Carvilius. The two events must have been nearly or quite simultaneous, and it may be that C., born about B. C. 310, was a protégé of Appius.

4. pp. 19-57. Novae Lectiones Euripideae (By H. van Herwerden). Nearly two hundred conjectures.

5. pp. 58-61. L. Duvius Avitus (By R. Mowat). The author shows from inscriptions found at Pompeii that the name was *Duvius*, and not Dubius nor Vibius—shapes under which it appears in MSS. of Pliny and Tacitus.

6. p. 61. Note (by Éd. Tournier) replying to a criticism of Cobet on Choricius, *Aratius* VII, 2, *<νῖν> γνῶνται παιδίον*, and showing that the true reading is *νννὶ καὶ παιδίον*.

7. pp. 62-64. Hor. Od. I 2, 39-40 (By E. Benoist). *Mauri peditis*. B. opposes the “emendation” of *Mauri* into *Marsi*, and the interpretation of

peditis as "a horseman dismounted"; and defends the common reading and natural interpretation, showing that they are not inconsistent with historical facts. Possibly *peditis* is used to suggest that the enemy (*hostem*) is mounted.

8. p. 64. (By λ.) A passage of Arnobius (I 59) proves that the circumflex and the acute were pronounced differently.

9. pp. 65-77. An Unedited Letter of Harpocration to an Emperor. Published from MS. N-110, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid (By Ch. Graux). This MS. contains the hermetic collection known as the *Kupavīdeś*. This Harpocration is probably the H. who was the friend of Libanius, and may have been identical with Valerius H. whose name appears at the head of the Lexicon of the Ten Orators. The letter contains evidence that it was written after the decline of the magic art, and yet the writer is evidently an advocate of magic; hence the inference that the emperor addressed was Julian the Apostate, as there was no other emperor of that period to whom one would have dared to send such a letter. These points are carefully discussed by Graux in an introduction, and the letter itself is accompanied by very valuable notes, critical and exegetical. Especially interesting are the notes (40 and 81) on *lecanomancy* and *άκτινοβολία*. The letter is incomplete and would appear to have been sent along with a copy of King Necepso's Book of Fourteen Remedies. It is not uninteresting, and it is difficult to determine whether the writer was a charlatan or a dupe. Having studied successfully in Asia, he goes to Alexandria and learns the healing art; but on attempting to put into practice the remedies and astrological appliances of Necepso, he makes a signal failure. Wandering about in despair, and "praying without ceasing" for divine aid, he finally meets with a priest in Diospolis (Thebes), who still understands lecanomancy, and grants him an interview with Asclepius himself in real presence. The god commences a lecture on astrological pharmaceutics—and the MS. breaks off, but not in time to save the lecturer, god as he is, from two stupid blunders (Harpocration, however, does not see them).

10. pp. 78-83. Variations taken from a MS. of Justin of the twelfth century (By Al. Harant). The MS. in question is in the library of Laon, and seems to be one of the most important MSS. of Justin. In the article before us about thirty passages are discussed by means of new variations furnished by this MS. The date (1139) and the copyist's name are recorded on it thus:

Alrici studeo liber est hic script' in anno
Tredeties deno milleno ter quoq; termo.

11. pp. 84-92. Critical Observations (By H. Weil). a) On the Ionian prose-writers: emendations of certain fragments of Pherecydes of Syros, Hecataeus, Heraclitus, and the *περὶ ἀρχαίς ιητρικῆς* of Hippocrates. b) On Thucyd.: emendation and discussion of III 22, 3; 39, 4; 39, 8; 42, 5; 44, 1; 65, 3; 67, 7; 82, 8; I 76, 2; VI 38, 4. Most of these emendations commend themselves.

12. pp. 93-96. Three passages of Ennius (By L. Havet). Emendations of I 34 Vahlen (Cic. de Divin. I 20, 40); VII 10 Vahlen (A. Gell. XII 4); XII 1 Vahlen (Priscian, V 3, 17 and VI 7, 40).

13. pp. 97-143. New researches in Stichometry (By Ch. Graux). This is a very elaborate article. a) The author shows that stichometry was not

confined to the Alexandrians, and that the *στίχος* in prose was a fixed quantity, having been originally determined, in all probability, by the length of a Homeric line. He gives a table, extending through 13 pp., containing the number of *στίχοι* reported in ancient MSS. for Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, Demosthenes, the Old and New Testaments, Eusebius, St. Gregory and Euthalius, with the sources from which the numbers were taken, and the value of the *στίχοι* in letters, determined by estimating the number of letters and dividing by the number of *στίχοι*. (They all fall between 34 and 38 letters. The Homeric verse averages about 37.) The table is accompanied by notes of great value. *b*) There was no relation between measurement by *στίχοι*, and the division "per cola et commata" employed in certain MSS. of Demosthenes, Cicero, and the Bible. This point is elaborately discussed and fully established. *c*) The numeration of the *στίχοι*, or lines, was of service in making reference to books which had the numbers at intervals on the margin, and especially in determining the pay of copyists. An edict of Diocletian (A. D. 301) *de pretiis rerum venalium*, fixed the pay of scribes at so much *per hundred lines*, which would have been perfectly idle, had not the *line* been a fixed quantity. Of course it was not necessary to make the actual lines of the same length as the normal *στίχος*. The number for each work was already known. For new works it is to be supposed that a MS. was written with uniform pages and the number of *στίχοι* determined by partial counting and computation. The *πίνακες* (catalogues) of the great Alexandrian libraries, prepared by Callimachus (about the middle of the third century) indicated the number of *στίχοι* for each work. The publishing of these catalogues, instead of spreading the custom of indicating the size of works in *στίχοι*, did much to put an end to it, by rendering it unnecessary.

14. p. 143. Note (by Γ) pronouncing a certain inscription of two words (published as "ancient" by the *Αρχαιον*, VI 4) to be at most 400 years, and at least three months old.

15. pp. 144-175. Journey of Horace to Brundisium (By E. Desjardins). The author modifies some views expressed in his *Voyage d' Horace à Brindes*, published in 1855. This article gives the results of a careful study of the entire route, describing cities, scenery, etc., as they were seen by Horace. A map specially prepared for the purpose accompanies the article. Some light is thrown upon a few passages, as vv. 25-6. The immortal Aufidius Luscus, "praetor" of Fundi, was really no praetor at all (as is clearly shown by inscriptions), but was *aedilis jure dicundo*; but his functions were similar to those of praetor in the city, and his title was rather cumbrous for verse, and then some humor or sarcasm is felt in the lofty title of praetor. The name of the *oppidulum* "quod versu dicere non est," was probably *Asculum Apulum*, and not *Equus Tunicus*, as some suppose, for this was off the route. "Asculum" could be put into a hexameter, but only by means of an undesirable elision. A modern commentator [who? H.] thinks the difficulty was that Horace was too modest to write the last two syllables of the name!¹ At verses 82-85 he could have written them without blushing seriously. The interview between Antonius

¹ As if the difference of quantity did not sufficiently mark the kind of termination and prevent a *κακέμφατον*! Quod si recipias: nihil loqui tutum est, Quint. VIII 3, 47.—B. L. G.

and Octavius did not take place at Brundisium, as was expected, but at Tarentum.

16. p. 175. Two brief Notes. *a*) In Justin, VII 3, 4, "Adhibitis in convivium suum filiis et uxoribus," H. W. changes *suum filiis* into *concubinis* to suit Herod., VII 18, *καὶ τὰς παλλακὰς καὶ τὰς κονυδίας γυναικας*. *b*) E. T. emends Steph. Byzant. sub voc. Αἴσαγδα.

17. p. 176. On Claudian, Epigr. 2 (By Max Bonnet). Place vv. 15-18 between 4 and 5.

18. p. 176. In Aesch. Prom., 43, *ἀκος γὰρ οὐδὲν τὸν δε θρηνεῖσθαι*, Éd. Tournier proposes *τῷδε*.

19. pp. 177-187. Some remarks on the officers called *Praefecti* during the last period of the Roman Republic (By J. N. Madvig). These were at first *praefecti sociorum (socium)*, who commanded a number of cohorts, each cohort being under a native officer of the allies. Their command not being a fixed and permanent one, various duties were assigned to them, such as commanding garrisons, forts, etc. The governors sent out to provinces took prefects with them; and if no war arose the office was a sinecure. When all the Italians became Roman citizens, there would have been no *raison d'être* for prefects, had not their functions been thus already extended; but now they were called simply "praefecti." The prefects of Caesar in Gaul were purely military officers, usually young and inexperienced in war, and commanded Gallic cavalry, etc., but those of the other provinces had nothing to do; and they could even remain at home, but be regarded as *absentes reipublicae causa*, which exempted them from all civil duties; and as those of *iudex* were onerous and otherwise unpleasant, the *praefectura* was a much sought office. With this light we can restore Cic. ad Att. V, 7: *Sed tamen ut mandatum scias me curasse, quot ante ait Pompejus quinos praefectos delaturum novos vacationes iudicariam causam.*" Read: *vacationis iudicariae causa*. The nomination expressed by *deferre* here was merely intended to excuse from judiciary service. Hence, in Cic. ad Att. V 11: "nunc redeo ad quae mihi mandas: in praefectis excusatio iis quos voles deferre," read *excusandis* instead of *excusatio iis*. This *deferre* was really *deferre ad aerarium*, that being the place where such lists were received and filed (i. e., hung up). Many proofs of this are given by the author.

Post scriptum: Cic. ad Att. II 14, says: "basilicam habeo, non villam, frequentia Formianorum," which is followed in the modern editions by "at quam parem basilicae tribum Aemiliam!" But *parem* here is a conjecture of S. Dubois, the MSS. giving *partem*. We should read: "at quam partem basilicae? Tribum Aemiliam!" (i. e., the most crowded and turbulent part).

20. p. 187. Emendatiuncula. Éd. Tournier proposes *η'* for *ῃ* or *ῃ* in Od. XI 172. [This would remove many other instances of hiatus in Homer.]

21. pp. 188-194. De fragmentis quibusdam Historicorum in Codice Athoo repertis (By C. G. Cobet). Discussion and emendation of about thirty passages of Dexippus, Priscus, Eusebius and Aristodemus.

22. p. 194. Emendation of Herod. I 37 (by Éd. T.), and of a frag. of Ennius (by *λ.*), and of a passage of Philoxenus (by T.).

23. pp. 195-203. Observationes criticae (By H. van Herwerden). Emendations of fourteen passages in Hom. Il., fourteen in Od., five in Hymns and twenty-four in Xen. Cyropaed. These corrections deserve careful attention.

24. pp. 204-214. *Observations on Hor.*, Book I, Odes 1, 3, 12, 20 (By Gaston Boissier). Opposes the arbitrary method of Peerlkamp and his imitators. Defends the authenticity of the first two and last two verses of Ode 1, of *trahuntque siccas machinae carinas* in Ode 3, of the disputed verses in Ode 12 and of the whole of Ode 20.

25. p. 214. *Emendatiuncula* (By Éd. Tournier). *Soph. Antig.* 124-5: put *τοῖος*—*Ἄπεος* in parenthesis without pause before or after it.

26. pp. 215-218. New information concerning three Greek writers (By P. Foucart). *a* Polemon the Periegete, *son of Milesios* (and not of Euegetes, as Suidas says), was made *πρόξενος* at Delphi. *b*) Hegesianax of Alexandria in the Troad, *son of Diogenes*, made *πρόξενος* at Delphi. *c*) Philip, son of Aristides, of Pergamus. An inscription (published in the *Παλιγγενεῖα*, July 18, 1874) on the base of a statue erected to his honor at Epidaurus, contains: *a*) a dedication in two elegiac distichs, in the Doric dialect, and *b*) a dozen lines of the Introduction to a History written by him, in the Ionic dialect. But for this inscription we should not have known of his existence. The indications are that the inscription and its subject belong to the end of the third century B. C.

27. pp. 218-237. Supplement to the *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* (By Ch. Graux). The MS. Σ-I-20 of the Escorial contains 1600 articles, each being composed of a proverb accompanied by explanations. Graux discusses the MS. and gives ninety-four articles, containing: *a*) variations useful in establishing the correct reading, and *b*) proverbs, or explanations of proverbs, partly or entirely new. Important critical notes are added.

28. pp. 238-240. On the date of the *Dictys* of Septimius (By L. Havet). Brief history of this hoax, with discussion of the views of different scholars. The appellation of *consularis* instead of *proconsul* given to Rutilius Rufus in the work places it after A. D. 350. A not very definite posterior limit is fixed by the fact that Syrianus of Alexandria cites the work in his commentary on the Rhetoric of Hermogenes (A. D. 400 or later).

29. p. 240. On Hor. Od. III 23, 16-20 (By Walz). The condition lies in *immunis* (innocent), and *non sumptuosa* must be taken together as a single idea, inexpensive (a *sumptuosa hostia* would be a self-contradiction, *hostia* denoting an insignificant offering), and construed as *means* by which the hand is made *blandior* (agreeable to the Penates).

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE. Vol. III. 1879.

1. pp. 1-13. Studies on Demosthenes. The Olynthian and Euboean Wars (By Henri Weil). Discussion of the question: In what year occurred the second of the four campaigns of the Athenians in Euboea? Diodorus does not mention it; Plutarch confounds it with another campaign. Demosthenes mentions it several times in the *Contra Midiam*, and at § 191 we learn that a part of the knights who served in Euboea were transported to Olynthus. But Dion. Hal. seems to place the battle of Tamynae two years *before* the date of the Olynthian war as given by Philochorus. The rest of this article is devoted chiefly to reconciling the statements of Dion. Hal. and Philochorus, which is accomplished by amending Dionysius and putting *Θουδῆμον* and *not Θελῶν* in a lacuna in C. I. A. 2, 105.

2. p. 13. Palaeographic note (By Γ.). At the end of the Oration against Philip's Letter in MS. F. of Demosthenes, read Διάρθωται ἀπὸ δύο Ἀττικανῶν and not Διάρθωται ἀπὸ δύο Ἀττικανά as Voemel writes it. In the MS. it is Αττικῶν with contraction mark after κ. But ω above the line stands for υν as often as for ως, a fact not stated in works on Palaeography. So ο=ον in certain MSS.; instances of α, ε, η, υ=ας, εν, ες, ης, υν, which are rare.

3. pp. 14-15. Apropos of a verse of Juvenal (VII 104) (By Gaston Boissier). *Quis dabit historico quantum daret acta legenti?* The *acta* were not necessarily official proceedings (cf. Cic. ad Fam. II 15, with *ibid.* VIII 7), but included private transactions and even rumors and gossip. The *acta legentes* were those who composed the journals containing these *acta*. Hence: "Who will pay a historian as much as he would pay a *reporter*?"

4. p. 15. Note on Xen. Cyropaed. VIII 1, 20, and Procopius, Gothic War, I 14 (By X.).

5. pp. 16-18. Note on a MS. of the library of Schlestadt (By A. Giry). This MS. (No. 1153 bis), which has never been collated, contains: a) A collection of recipes and directions with regard to arts and measurements, mostly of the middle ages, but partly dating from the late Roman empire. The most important, entitled ΣΥΜΕΤΡΙΑ ΑΝΘΡΟΠΟΙΟΥ (*sic*), gives a passage of Vitruvius, and is followed by some pen sketches of capitals, bases, entablatures, volutes, etc. b) The six books of Vitruvius, well worth examining. c) An abridgment of Vitruvius by M. Cetus (or Cetius) Faventinus. d) Further recipes, etc., which are found also in the *Cod. Leidensis*, etc.

6. pp. 19-25. On the meaning of the exclamation *malum!* (By Constant Martha.) The definitions in the Dictionaries are all wrong. "Malum!" is applied only to *folly*, of whatever degree, from ordinary ineptitude up to downright madness. The author enumerates all the known examples, showing that such is its use in each instance. In the more serious authors, orators and philosophers, the expression is always immediately followed by *amentia*, *dementia*, or something signifying folly or madness, with one exception, where the sentence is addressed to a prince; and in all writers, though the feeling of the speaker may be anger, disgust, etc., still the *cause* of the feeling is always folly of some sort, in word or deed; and the sentence is always interrogative. The origin is discussed: probably a superstitious deprecation. [Could it originally have been *Di malum avertant*, the *malum=dementiam*? The author makes no attempt to translate it into French; but the English "in the name of common sense" seems to be its exact equivalent.]

7. pp. 26-27. On Catullus (By E. Benoist). a) LV 20:

Quos cunctos mihi, Cameri, dicares.

Some read *iunctos*; but the true reading, *vinctos*, is established from MSS. (cf. Hom. Od. V, 17-26). b) XXII 7-9. All the MSS. give *membrane*, all the editions *membrana*. We should read thus:

Novi umbilici, lora rubra, membranae,
Drecta plumbo et pumice omnia aequata.

Membranae denotes the cover, and it was the lines on the pages that were *drecta plumbo* and *aequata*.

8. pp. 28-31. Certain passages of Iph. Taur. (By Éd. Tournier). Twenty-one conjectures, and rejection of two passages (958-960 and 1455-1457).

9. p. 32. On a new Frag. of Aeschylus (By H. W.). Found by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in the Cod. Marcianus 423 of the Scholia of Aristides. H. W. proposes some emendations.

10. pp. 33-63. The cult of the *Divi* and the cult of Rome and Augustus (By E. Desjardins). The author sums up the results of this elaborate investigation under five heads: a) The cult of emperors and members of the imperial family, *Divi* and *Divae*, had Rome for its centre. They were all honored together in the college of the *Sodales Augustales*, and each individually by *flamines* who bore the names of *flamen Divi Augusti*, *Divi Claudi*, etc. b) This last cult, prevalent in the cities of Italy, and in Narbonne, was less common in other provinces, and very rare in Africa; and in Spain alone this cult and that of Rome and Augustus, without being associated, were in the hands of the same *flamens*. c) The political cult of Rome and Augustus (two divinities combined into one—the Genius of the Roman People) dates back to the year 29, and was established by Augustus in honor of Rome and Caesar, and was spread through all the provinces, where it flourished for three centuries. This cult, though at first imposed, was afterward adopted with readiness by the natives and non-citizens, who alone were called by the Senate and Emperors to the priesthood of this universal religion, which was essentially Roman through the object of worship, and essentially native through the exclusive choice of priests who were strangers, in origin at least, to the Roman citizenship. d) For three centuries this cult was of two sorts, *provincial* and *municipal*: provincial, with a *concilium* composed of *legati* of each of the cities of the province, electing a *flamen* and a *sacerdos Romae et Augusti*; municipal with a *flamen Augusti*, elected by the *ordo decurionum*, generally called *perpetuus*, although his active functions were annual. e) From the beginning of the fourth century the *sacerdotes* and *flamines* of the provinces and cities, representing henceforth another thing, continued, though Christianity was established, the former called *sacerdotales*, and the latter *flamines perpetuui*, representing the pagan and Christian aristocracy of the cities, and to this last category belong the thirty-six *flamines* of the *Ordo Thamugas* (discussed in the earlier part of the article).

It is worthy of note that in some instances baptized Christians, as Constantine the Great, received the apotheosis.

11. p. 64. On Sidonius Apollinaris (By É. Chatelain). a) Carm. 9, 296: "In castris hedera ter aureatus" is a conjecture, the MSS. giving *ter laureatus*, which the metre forbids. Read *hederate*, *laureatus*. (For the vocative, see Carm. 23, 67). b) Carm. 11, 56: "Cujus fax, arcus, corythus pendebat at ille": remove false quantity in *corythus* by writing *pendet*.

12. pp. 65-67. A passage of the Georgics (By O. Nigolae). In Georg. I, 221-222:

Ante tibi Eoae Atlantides abscondantur,
Gnosiaque ardentis decedat stella corone,

Vergil designates the morning setting of the Pleiades and the heliac setting of Corona Borealis. The former occurred (popularly speaking) in the last days of October and the first of November. The other should have occurred, according to this passage, about the same time. It has been supposed that

in this passage Vergil made a mistake, and that he should have said the *rising* and not the setting of the Crown. The argument is this: The heliac rising of the Crown occurred (according to Pliny and others (!)) at the first of October; the heliac setting always occurs earlier than the heliac rising; therefore the heliac setting must have occurred before the month of October. The major premiss is true of constellations south of the ecliptic, but for those north of it, like the Crown, the very converse is true; that is, the heliac rising precedes the heliac setting. [The demonstration given by the author is hardly necessary, as any one who is at all acquainted with the apparent motion of the heavenly bodies can see the truth of the proposition at once, when his attention is called to it.] Nor is there any need of *authorities*. The heliac setting of the Crown in the lat. of Rome takes place at the middle of December, which is (because of the precession of the equinoxes) twenty-seven days later than its occurrence in the days of Vergil. Of course the popular notion of heliac rising and setting allowed a broad margin.

13. pp. 68-78. Homeric (By H. van Herwerden). Discussion (with emendations) of thirteen passages of the Iliad, six of the Odyssey, and two of the Hymns.

14. p. 78. Emendatiuncula (By É. T.). *a*) Aesch. Pers. 284: read *στενῶ* for *στένω*. *b*) Herod. I 132: for . . . *κρέα*. *Διαθέντος* read . . . *κρέάδα*. *Θέντος* . . . *c*) Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1251, *τοσαῦτα* replies to *πολλὰ* of preceding verse. Change *οἴκουν* into *οἴκοιν*.

15. pp. 79-90. Miscellaneous criticisms (By L. Havet). I. On an Oration of Cato. A frag. of his *Origines* quoted by Fronto, containing a quotation from Cato's *De Sumptu suo*, which in its turn quotes briefly from his *Sponsio*. By printing the different parts in different type, the whole frag. is rendered (for the first time?) intelligible. II. On the Medea and the Andromache of Ennius. Three passages elucidated or emended. III. An old enigma in Varro, cited by Aulus Gellius (XII, 6) in three senarii. Objections to Bart's restoration. Read, with slight change of MS.:

Semel minusne, an bis minu'? Non sit sat. Scio:
Vtrumque eorum. Vt quandam audiui dicier
Ioui ipsi regi noluit concedere.

The word is *terminus*. IV. On the prefaces of the *Dictys* of Septimius (7 pp.). There are two prefaces to this work: one, a *letter* to Q. Aradius Rufus, the other, a *prologue*. It is shown almost to absolute demonstration, that the work was published three times. At the second publication, the sixth Book was added, and the letter served as a preface to this Book alone. The third time (hoping to suppress the letter entirely) the author prefixed the prologue to the entire work, explaining difficulties more fully to the suspicious, and even contradicting the letter in some particulars. But some copyist in the course of time found the letter and added it on the blank space before the prologue. Hence, some MSS. have it, and some have not. If this theory is true, it will be found that all the MSS. which contain the letter belong to the same family—a point not yet examined. V. *Diploma pedestre*. In an inscription near Carthage occurs this verse (!): *Diploma circaui totam regione pedestrem*, where *regione* is *acc.* and *pedestrem* is *abl.*, agreeing with *Diploma* (1st Dec.)!

The author pronounced -e and -em alike, and failed to discriminate properly in writing. VI. *Aegritudo Perdicæ*, V 174: read *cetera dicat*.

16. pp. 91-151. Philo Byzantinus. Fortifications (By A. de Rochas and Ch. Graux). [The following is Graux's own summary of this elaborate article.] 1) Preliminary notice, containing *a*) the biography of this engineer (second century B. C.); *b*) an examination of what is left us of his *Μηχανικὴ σύνταξις*, whether in the original text, or under the form of a summary in Greek, or in Latin translation made from the Arabic, with indication of the editions, translations, and works relating to the author, and a review of what is known of the lost portions, with an attempt at a partial restitution of the order in which the different books of this great work succeeded each other; *c*) the classification of twenty-nine MSS. of Book IV and of the so-called Book V, which are traced back to three MSS. of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the determination of the relation between the only edition of the so-called Book V, and the MSS.; *d*) examples, *a*) of improvements of the text suggested by the new basis of criticism, and *b*) of conjectures proposed in certain cases where the testimony of the MSS. agrees; *e*) the plan followed in the publication; *f*) invitation of the attention of philologists to this important text, which is in a bad condition. 2) Text of Philo from p. 79 to p. 86 of the *Veteres Mathematici*, with *apparatus criticus* intended to be complete, French translation opposite the text, and exegetical notes with five cuts. Among these notes are some technical observations on cements (*γύψος*), *κλίνη* (unity of rectangular surface), the *έλεπολις* of Demetrius Poliorcetes, the dimensions and range of the *ταλανταιος πετροβόλος*, etc.; lexicographical notes on *γύψος* (sometimes *lime*), *μηχάνημα* (a tower of wooden frame-work), *πετροβόλοι*, *λιθοβόλοι*, *κατάπλαται*, *όξυβαλεῖς* (denoting sometimes machines, and sometimes the projectiles hurled by them), *βέλη* (also with double meaning), *άμφιπλευρος*, *δρόσις*, *έφεξις*, *τειχοποιία* and *πυργοποιία*, *δίοδος* and *πάροδος*, *βελόστασις* (place prepared for a machine), *έπεξέρχεσθαι*, *βάρη πέργοι βαρεῖς*, *έπάλξεις*, *έπάλξιον*, *θυρίδες* and *προμαχῶνες*, *έμβολεῖς* (*ξύλινος*), *ἱπορύνττειν* and *διορύνττειν*, *δοκίδες* (*χελώνη ὄρυκτρις*), *στοιά*, *άμφιβολος*, etc. In the preliminary notice and the exegetical notes, various conjectures on Athenaeus Mathematicus and Diodorus Siculus; also on Hero Alexandrinus (Belop. 10), Plutarch (Demetr. 21, 1), Josephus (War V 4, 3), Polyaenus (VII 9), Athenaeus (XIII p. 538, B), etc. [This work contains much valuable information and must have required immense labor.]

17. pp. 152-153. Varia (By P. Thomas). I. On the Hortensius of Cicero. New proofs that this work had ceased to exist in the middle ages. II. Manilius, Astron. V 322-323: for *suadetque* read *gaudetque*. III. Ter. Heaut. v. 1017-1020: omit what comes between *Id quid* and *tui similis est probe*.

18. pp. 154-160. Observations on the text of Sidonius Apollinaris (By É. Chatelain). The author, having examined all the editions and classified the MSS., gives *a*) twelve corrections after all the MSS., and *b*) thirteen corrections after one or more MSS.

19. p. 160. Priscian I 9, 52 (By L. Havet). Instead of "austrum pro ostrum" (where o is short), read "austium pro ostium."

20. The *Revue des Revues* for 1878 and 1879 contains abstracts of many periodicals not reviewed in 1877, and more countries are represented.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. I Band. Halle, 1878.¹

The Prospectus prefixed to the first volume of the *Anglia* informs us that in the last decade, especially since the establishment of chairs for English in the universities, the study of English has greatly increased in Germany, and as the *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur* had ceased to appear, it was thought that this branch of philology was strong enough to have a journal of its own; hence the foundation of the *Anglia*, the first part of which, edited by Prof. R. P. Wülcker, of Leipzig, contains essays in the whole field of the English language and literature, from the seventh century to the present, not excluding the dialects; also texts not yet edited or not easily accessible, if not too lengthy, and collations of valuable works. The second part, edited by Dr. M. Trautmann, Privat-Docent at Leipzig, contains criticisms of all new publications relating to English philology, and at the close of each year a bibliography of the preceding year. Each volume consists of three numbers, which appear at intervals during the year, and two complete volumes have so far appeared. A summary of the contents of the first volume will be given in the present paper, and these summaries will be continued from time to time.

I. The first number opens with The last published essay of the lamented Anglo-Saxon scholar, C. W. M. Grein, who died June 15, 1877. This is a paper entitled *Ist die Bezeichnung "angelsächsische Sprache" wirklich unberechtigt?* Grein cites passages from Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, containing titles of kings, from Alfred to Edward the Confessor, in which the terms, *Angul-saxonum*, *Angul-saxna*, and their variations occur forty-four times, and in some passages *Anglo-Saxons* are distinguished from *Northumbrians*, whence Grein concludes that we are justified in using the term *Anglo-Saxon* speech in distinction from the later language, and from the language spoken north of the Humber. Wülcker refers in a note to the well-known essay of Freeman, in the appendix to the first volume of his *History of the Norman Conquest*, and to an article by Prof. Lounsbury, in the *New Englander* for January, 1876, combatting Freeman.

J. Zupitza follows with The text of the *Poema Morale*, after MS. D., which MS. has been heretofore known only from extracts in Hickes' *Thesaurus*, a comparison of the six MSS. with each other to determine their relations, and a discussion of the age of the poem, which Zupitza assigns to about 1170, as against Dr. R. Morris, who thinks it "probable that all the numerous versions of the Moral Ode are transcribed from some late tenth or early eleventh-century version."

R. Köhler finds A story similar to Chaucer's Miller's Tale in Valentin Schumann's *Nachtbüchlein*, published in 1559. He thinks Schumann could not have derived his story from Chaucer, but they must have had a common original. A part of the story is found also in the *Novellino* of Masuccio of Salerno, who lived in the second half of the fifteenth century, as stated by

¹In the case of the *Anglia*, and in a few other periodicals of recent establishment, it has been thought best to begin the summary with the beginning for the sake of completeness.—ED.

Hippisley, *Chapters on Early English Literature*, London, 1837, on the authority of *The British Bibliographer*, by Brydges, London, 1810-14. This fact had eluded the vigilance of Tyrwhitt.

H. Dünzter discusses Two essays on Marlowe's Faust, in the *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, one by Schmid on the relation of Marlowe's play to the German and to the English Faustbook; the other by Albers on later additions to the play. Dünzter finds that Marlowe used the English Faustbook translated from the German edition of 1588. He also cites certain passages supposed to be added by a later hand.

C. Horstmann gives in full The texts of the Legends of Celestinus and Susanna, and comments at length on each. The MS. of the Celestinus is of the fifteenth century, but the poem is more than a century older than the MS. It is in the East-Midland dialect, though not pure, for it betrays peculiarities of the copyist. After examining with true German thoroughness the language and the rime, Horstmann concludes that the poem is one of the older productions of Old English literature, and probably has the same author as the *Gregorius*. It belongs to the same dialect and period with *Havelok*, *Gregorius*, and the *Song of Alexius*. Alliteration is seldom met with, and the metre has not yet been found in any other legend.¹ The Susanna shows such a mixture of Northern, Midland and Southern forms that it is difficult to determine the original dialect, but it must have been the Northern. Its complete rhythm and metre, rime and alliteration, make it probable that it was intended for singing; the melody follows almost of itself. Dr. Morris assigns this poem to the author of *Sir Gawayne*, about 1360, and calls the dialect "West-Midland," but Horstmann thinks it belongs much further north.

W. Sattler contributes a Series of examples illustrating the use of prepositions in modern English, and—I, *to expect from* and *to expect of*. He lays down canons, some of which can scarcely be sustained, but we have not space to go into an examination of them. His "numerous examples" are undoubtedly "welcome," but to the deductions from them we might take exception, for in good modern English usage it is often immaterial whether we use *from* or *of* after *expect*, and the distinctions drawn are sometimes rather fine spun. A thorough familiarity with the modern spoken language is necessary for such generalizations.

M. Trautmann follows with a very full and thorough article on the poet Huchown and his works. He cites the passage from Wyntown's *Chronicle of Scotland*, referring to Huchown, and the opinions of Chalmers, Laing, Sir Frederic Madden, Dr. Richard Morris, Panton, and Donaldson, with respect to his works. Trautmann subjects the nine poems sometimes attributed to Huchown to a careful examination, linguistic and metrical, and finds that four poems, *Gawayn* and the *Grene Knyght*, *The Pearl*, *Cleanness*, and *Patience*, are from the same author; the *Morte Arthure* is not by the author of these, nor is the *Troy Book*, and these two are by different authors; *Golagros* and *Gawane* is by a different author still, and so is the *Anturs of Arther at the Tarnewathelan*; but finally, the *Susanna* must have been written by the same author as the *Morte Arthure*. The next section goes to prove that this writer was the real Huchown, and the last section that Wyntown's Huchown and Sir Hugh of Eglintoun, mentioned by Dunbar, were one and the same person, who "flourished about

¹ See, however, III following.

the middle of the fourteenth century," in Scotland, as suggested by Chalmers.

The first part of this number concludes with a Collation of the Poetical Salomon and Saturn with the MS., by H. Sweet. Kemble's text was used in this collation, and Sweet finds many corrections necessary. "The majority of the spellings altered by Kemble are good Early West-Saxonisms, and two passages unintelligible in Kemble's and Grein's texts are now made perfectly clear by reference to the MS."

The second part contains Notices, by F. A. Leo, of Karl Elze's Shakespeare Halle, 1876, and of von Friesen's pamphlet, Dr. Karl Elze's William Shakespeare, Leipzig, 1876, in which von Friesen defends Shakespeare against the suspicion that he is "no good Christian," and contends against the designation "humanist;" but, says Leo, "dem humanisten Elze ist er der humanist, dem gläubigen christen Friesen der gläubige christ. Und so möge es bleiben, so lange Shakespeare bleibt, denn: 'liest doch nur jeder aus dem buch sich heraus'." There follows a review, by W. Wagner, of Ward's History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne, London, 1875, and one by R. Wülcker of Arnold's ^B Beowulf, London, 1876. The tenor of Wülcker's review may be gathered from the following judgment, which he undertakes to establish, and which, we must confess, is but too well founded: "Durch Arnold's werk ist die angelsächsische philologie auch um keinen schritt weiter gebracht worden; im gegentheil bekundet sich darin an vielen stellen ein offenbarer rückschritt gegen die einzelausgabe Beowulfs durch Grein und die von Heyne." Most of Wülcker's article is occupied with a criticism of Arnold's Introduction, in which he takes exception to Arnold's description of the MS., his deficient bibliography, his arguments for the date and origin of the Beowulf, especially to the slight grounds adduced for assigning it to the same period with the Guthlac, and to the hypothesis, "original" with Arnold, of the way in which the materials for the poem came to England. As to the "liedertheorie," Arnold confounds author and copyist, and dismisses the subject too hastily. Wülcker adds some remarks on the omission in the MS. of the numbers for Cantos XXIX and XXX, a small matter, in our opinion; some of his criticisms of Arnold, while in the main just, have reference to *kleinigkeiten*, and the whole tone is very depreciatory. In regard to most of Arnold's notes Wülcker is very right in saying that one who does not know his forms "mache sich überhaupt noch nicht an die lektüre Beowulfs." He concludes with criticisms of some of Arnold's remarks, chiefly of value for the rendering of v. 169 et seqq., which turns on the sense given to *gifstol*, which means the *hall Heorot*, according to Wülcker, and not simply the *throne* therein. The passage cited from Orosius in illustration of v. 69 et seqq., does not seem to us to the point. Wülcker is also right, finally, in charging Arnold with a failure to make use of the single editions of Grein and Heyne, the two latest and best German editions, and one who will make an edition of Beowulf cannot afford to disregard them. We cannot now go into the subject of Beowulf criticism, though we hope to return to it hereafter, but suffice it to say that we have carefully collated every line of Grein's text (1867) with the editions of Kemble, Thorpe, Arnold, and Heyne (1873), and we think it manifest that Arnold's text is printed from Thorpe's with some changes to correspond to Grein's text in the Bibliothek

der A. S. Poesie (1857). When we get the fac-simile of the MS., soon to be published by the Early English Text Society under the editorial supervision of Prof. Zupitza, of Berlin, we shall be in a better position to make an edition of Beowulf, and such an one as college and university students need, with critical and explanatory notes and glossary, and without translation, after the example of the editions of Grein and Heyne already referred to, which, for students of German, will answer all purposes. Some passages, doubtless, will always remain dark, for we have not the means for their elucidation; all we can do is to take the best conjecture accessible and make the most of it.

II. In the second number J. Zupitza gives the Texts of one English [Anglo-Saxon] and two Latin bee-spells, and goes into a criticism of text and translation of the former, which had been misunderstood except by Cockayne in his *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England*, I 384 (1864), Kemble and Rieger having referred the word *sigewif* to the *waelcyrian*, and Ten Brink having followed them; J. Grimm did not so do, but failed to give explanation or translation, his text being corrupt. Zupitza gives also a short fragment of an English Chronicle of the years 1113 and 1114 (Cott. Dom. A. IX), which had escaped the notice of the editors of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

K. Regel follows with an extended article on *Spruch und Bild im Layamon*. We would remark, by the way, that Rieger's first sentence consists of twenty-three lines and his second of sixteen, the two comprising one large octavo page. Barring this characteristically German style, the article is a very full and thorough comparison of Layamon's Brut with Wace's Brut and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, showing the dependence, and still more the independence, of Layamon in respect to his use of proverbs and metaphors. Want of space will not permit us to specify, but Regel's conclusion is fully justified that Layamon is not only "in überwiegendem masse" independent of Geoffrey and Wace, but exhibits such creative power that he appears as an unusually gifted poet.

C. S. Weiser investigates Pope's influence on Byron's youthful poems. Of modern poets Byron imitated, says Weiser, Shakespeare, Moore, and Pope; the first least of all, for Byron had no dramatic talent; the second chiefly in his lyrical poems; but Pope's influence reigned not only in his poetry, but in his thoughts and feelings. Weiser traces this influence in the *Hints from Horace*, *Curse of Minerva*, and *Hours of Idleness* chiefly, and, as regards form and rime, in English Bards and Scotch Reviewers and the Waltz. He next examines Pope's influence on the metre and rime of each of these poems, and concludes with citations from Byron's letters, showing his high opinion of Pope, thus justifying the assertion that Pope's influence on Byron's earlier poems was greater than that of any other poet.

W. Sattler continues his Examples of the use of prepositions in modern English with—II, *a visit to*, and—III, *welcome to*. The remarks on the examples show, as it seems to us, rather a book-knowledge of the language than a practical acquaintance with it. Note Anm. 1, p. 281, and Anm. 2, p. 285.

J. Zupitza contributes three Latin-English Proverbs, i. e. Anglo-Saxon—for in Zupitza's usage the term "English" covers anything from Caedmon down—and the Nicene Creed in an English copy of the twelfth century.

C. Horstmann follows with another of his valuable contributions, and this time the full Text of the *Canticum de Creatione*, an early English poem of 1200 lines, written, as we learn from the poem itself, in 1375, and from its mixture of Southern and Midland forms leading to the conclusion that it belongs to a locality where these dialects were in contact, and that at that period the fusion had already begun which resulted in the formation of a common literary language. Horstmann gives here, as before, a careful analysis of the language of the poem and a summary of its contents.

A. Holder furnishes Collations to Anglo-Saxon works, and—I, the variations of two Cottonian MSS. of an A. S. treatise, *De rebus in Oriente mirabilibus*, printed for the first time by Cockayne in his *Narratiunculae anglice conscriptae*, London, 1861.

K. Elze supplies Notes and conjectures to modern English poets, being comments on certain passages from Shakespeare, Fletcher, Marlowe, and Milton (Tem., M. of V. (2); J. C. (3); T. N. K., Ed. II, and P. L.).

The first part of this number concludes with an appreciative obituary notice of Grein, by R. Wülcker, containing a few biographical details and a list of Grein's works. Wülcker says: "Durch seine *textausgabe der angelsächsischen poesie* wurde überhaupt erst ein studium des Angelsächsischen, und damit der entwicklung der englischen sprache in Deutschland möglich. Sein *glossar* ist ein werk von solchem fleisse und solcher gründlichkeit, dass wir deutsche stolz darauf sein können." Others besides Germans may be permitted to be proud of Grein's services to Anglo-Saxon philology and to concur heartily in the following eulogy: "Stets wird uns Deutschen Grein's werk der grund bleiben, auf welchem wir weiter bauen, und stets werden billig denkende forscher, auch wenn sie weit vorangeschritten sind, des mannes in liebe und verehrung gedenken, welcher unter ungünstigen äussern verhältnissen mit grösster selbstverleugnung, mit einem fleisse, welcher auch nicht durch schwere krankheit gebrochen werden konnte, uns den weg gewiesen hat und die bahn geebnet, auf welcher wir nur weiter gehen können, und, wo in zukunft das studium des Englischen blüht in Deutschland, England und Amerika, wird Grein's name nicht vergessen sein."

In the book notices, W. Wagner concludes his review of Ward's *History of English Dramatic Literature*.

Dr. D. Asher notices J. Schümann's *See und seefahrt nebst dem metaphorischen gebrauch dieser begriffe in Shakespeare's dramen*.

R. Wülcker criticises Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, I bd., 1 heft. Heilbronn, 1877. We must repeat a remark, heretofore made, that this criticism is very depreciatory in its tone and rests in great part on small matters. It naturally led to a reply from Kölbing, and to this a rejoinder from Wülcker is prefixed to *Anglia* II band, 2 und 3 heft, so that we have the editors of two German periodicals devoted to the same object at loggerheads with each other, which cannot advance the cause of English philology. Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, like the *Anglia*, is intended to supply in part the discontinued *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische literatur*, and it is a credit to German scholars that they can sustain so well two periodicals of such merit in this field. Professor Skeat has expressed the opinion (in a private letter) that no such journal could be sustained in England, and we in America

venture to claim only a small corner in the American Journal of Philology. It is to be hoped, then, that for the sake of scholars abroad, who will take no interest in such personalities, harmony may reign between the editors of these periodicals, both of which are of great value to our science.

The book notices close with one by M. Trautmann of Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, Oxford, 1876, and his opinion is summed up by designating it "ein empfehlenswertes buch." After describing the arrangement of the book and giving its table of contents, Trautmann takes exception to some of Sweet's views as to Anglo-Saxon sounds. Sweet says: "s is always *sharp*;" Trautmann, "only *sonant* s can interchange with r." Trautmann then goes into a very full and strictly logical argument to show that A. S. *ea*, *eo*, *ed* *ed*, both the so-called breakings and the diphthongs, also the ablant *ed*, which he still further distinguishes (designating these sounds as *ea*¹, *ea*², *eo*¹, *eo*², *eo*³), should *not* be accented, as usually, on the *second* vowel, but on the *first*, and therefore *ea*² and *eo*², *eo*³, should no longer be written *ed* and *ed*. Trautmann's views, though not original with him, are well sustained and seem to us convincing. We should be glad to hear from Mr. Sweet further on the subject, for he is our chief English authority in Anglo-Saxon phonology. Wulcker has evidently been convinced, for the Prospectus of his new edition of Grein's Bibliothek, states that the forms *ea*, *eo* will hereafter be used. Trautmann gives Sweet's arrangement of the declensions and conjugations, and says: Sweet's behandlung der declination und conjugation ist nicht so gelehrt wie z. b. die in F. A. March's angelsächsischer grammatis, aber sie ist unendlich viel übersichtlicher und praktischer. To this last statement we beg leave to take exception. We have been using March's A. S. Reader for several years in teaching, and we consider the arrangement of the declensions by stem-vowels (also adopted by Heyne and Koch) as easy to remember as that by plural endings and less cumbersome; and the same may be said for the arrangement of the conjugations as compared with Sweet's—only we should prefer a subdivision of the *first*, the *a*-conjugation, as is made by Heyne and Koch—while the advantage of having a concise and scientific view of the conjugations, and a means of comparing the Anglo-Saxon with the other Teutonic dialects, which is itself a *practical* advantage, vastly counterbalances any supposed ease in learning a less scientific arrangement. Sweet's Reader is undoubtedly a well-prepared and useful book, excepting some misprints, which it is hoped the new edition has corrected; it can safely be recommended to all students of Anglo-Saxon.

III. In the third number C. Horstmann supplies an addition to Celestinus, a so-called Song to our Lady, in the same metre with the Legend of Pope Celestinus, which is found in the Göttingen MS. of the Cursor Mundi, and is written in the Northern dialect.

J. Zupitza communicates the Contents of two MSS. of Middle-English Legends, not mentioned by Horstmann in his Altenglische Legenden, one from the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, the other from the Bodleian. The former is of the end of the fourteenth century, the latter, of the beginning of the fifteenth. Zupitza cautions his "jüngere fachgenossen", to let the Legends alone, as Horstmann's "great" edition for the E. E. T. S. will soon appear. We have already seen that Zupitza uses the term "English"

for Anglo-Saxon and for twelfth-century English ; here he uses the expression, "Middle-English." It were much to be hoped that scholars would agree upon certain definite designations for the periods of English, and thus avoid the confusion of calling Anglo-Saxon merely "English" and the language of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries "Middle English." We shall not quarrel with any one for calling Anglo-Saxon "Old English," for so it is, but we should like to know definitely what stage of the language is under discussion. Zupitza, in remarks on Morris' Old English Miscellany, also gives the text of a poem in that collection, with the "nicht ganz passenden titel Long Life," from another MS. than the two used by Morris, and seeks to establish the relations between these MSS.

F. Rosenthal follows with a very full discussion of the alliterating English long-line in the fourteenth century. He uses eight poems in this investigation : Alisaunder, William of Palerne, Joseph of Arimathie, Piers the Plowman, Sir Gawayn, Pierce the Ploughman's Crede, Richard the Redeles, and the Crowned King. After describing the editions of these poems, Rosenthal notes the rhythmical characteristics of the verse, and then treats at length the alliteration, coming to the conclusion that the licenses which seldom occurred in Anglo-Saxon had increased very much in the fourteenth century, and specially noticeable was the repetition of the alliterating letters. The article closes with a comparative table illustrating the use of alliteration in the three texts of Piers Plowman.

A. Brandl communicates a letter, now in the Zurich Library, dated April 30, 1725, of the Saxon Court-poet König to Bodmer, in which mention is made of the First German translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, that by Th. Haake, died 1690, which is now lost.

J. Zupitza furnishes fifty Verbesserrungen und Erklärungen to the following works : Thorpe's *Apollonius* (9), Ettmüller's *A. S. Lexicon* (2), Skeat's *Havelok* (10), Lumby's *Floriz* (7), Chaucer's *Prologue* (7), Furnivall's *Arthur* (1), Peacock's *Myrc's Instructions* (3), and Wright's *Generydes* (11). Lack of space forbids comment, which some of these remarks invite.

R. P. Wulcker has a lengthy essay on the poet Cynewulf, chiefly devoted to controverting the views of Dietrich as to Cynewulf's origin and works. Wulcker gives a "romanhafte" life of Cynewulf after Dietrich's Marburg Programs with some additions from Grein and Rieger, and then discusses the four points: Cynewulf was a Northumbrian, was bishop of Lindisfarne 737-780, has some connection with the Ruthwell Cross, and wrote other works than the Riddles, Christ, Juliana, and Helena. He disposes very summarily of the views of Wright, Thorpe, and Kemble that he may have been the same person as Kenulfus, Abbot of Peterborough, about 992; and shows that Dietrich in his first Program (1860) controverted Leo's view that Cynewulf was a Northumbrian, while in his second (1865) he concurs in the first three above-mentioned positions. Wulcker combats these views at length, sometimes with Dietrich's own earlier arguments, and contends especially that Cynewulf was not the author of the *Vision of the Cross*, some verses of which are inscribed on the Ruthwell Cross. He thinks, finally, that Cynewulf wrote with positive certainty only the above-mentioned works, lived in the eighth

century, was a West-Saxon, and probably a scholar of Aldhelm, which view had been previously advanced by Grimm.

A. Holder continues his Collations of Anglo-Saxon Works with—II, *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*, first published by Cockayne in his *Narratiunculae anglice conscriptae*.

B. Ten Brink begins his *Beiträge zur Englischen Lautlehre* with—I, Introduction—Old English *g* (3)—*heng* and *heht*; and—II, *el* and *ɛl* in Middle-English. In the Introduction he concurs with Freeman, Sweet and Zupitza in the designation of the periods of English, so that Old-English=Anglo-Saxon, and with Scherer, as against Sweet, in the opinion that in short *ea*, *eo*, as well as in the diphthongs *ea*, *eo*, *e* forms the preponderating element, as already stated in his essay, "Zum englischen vocalismus" (Zeitschrift für d. Alt. XIX, 211). He treats Old-English *g* as of two kinds, *neither* being a proper medial mute, but both palatal-spirants, the first, denoted as *y¹* (=German *j*) as being used before *clear (hellen)* vowels, the second, *y²* (=Netherlandish *g*), before *dull (dunkeln)* vowels. He argues further that *e* is long in *heng*, but short in *heht*. In the second section Ten Brink discusses at length the two sounds *el* and *ɛl* in Chaucer—1, in Germanic, and—2, in Romanic and Greco-Latin words. He divides the Germanic words into three classes, according to their origin, and finds, by a careful study of Chaucer's rimes, that words of the first class do not rime with those of the third, but those of the second rime with either first or third, perfectly with the former; this shows that words of the second class often have two forms, one with *el* and the other with *ɛl*. Ten Brink hopes "dass die behandlung das *e*-lauts ein wichtiges kriterium abgeben wird für die grenzbestimmung der dialekte, sowie für die bestimmung der herkunft mittelenglischer gedichte." We can give but a very superficial idea of the thorough treatment of the matters discussed in this article, and must refer phonetists to the article itself. Too little attention has been paid by English grammarians to the study of English sounds, but under the leadership of Ellis, Sweet, and German scholars, a change is taking place.

R. Wulcker contributes a short obituary notice of Ludwig Ettmüller, with a list of his numerous works, which have given him "eine bedeutende stellung in der entwicklungsgeschichte der englischen philologie, so dass wie ihn zu den 'altvätern' dieser noch jungen wissenschaft in Deutschland rechnen dürfen." Wulcker also gives information about Grein's Works. He will continue the *Bibliothek der A. S. Prosa*, and will publish a new edition of the *Poesie* after a collation of the MSS., a new edition of the *Beowulf*, and also of Grein's translation of *Beowulf*.

The book notices open with one by G. Baist, of Hofmann and Vollmöller's edition of *Der Münchener Brut Gottfried von Monmouth in französischen versen des XII. jhd.*, Halle, 1877.

There follows a short notice, by Dr. K. Sachs, of Kölbing's edition of the first volume of Fiedler's *Wissenschaftliche Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1877. The first edition of this volume appeared in 1850; meantime the author died, and the second volume (the Syntax) was prepared by Sachs (1861). He was obliged to decline the request to prepare a second edition of the first volume, and this was undertaken by Kölbing. Sachs notes the

changes made in this edition, and recommends it to all who wish to make a scientific study of English.

N. Delius reviews at some length Koppel's *Textkritische Studien über Shakespeare's Richard III und King Lear*, Dresden, 1877.

E. Sievers subjects Zupitza's edition of Cynewulf's *Elene*, Berlin, 1877, to a very careful examination and criticism. Sievers welcomes the book as an evidence that greater attention is being paid to Anglo-Saxon poetry, and thinks it high time, for the *Beowulf* has heretofore occupied scholars exclusively, without their having yet given us a "readable edition" (!) of that poem. He notices differences in Zupitza's text from that of Grimm and of Grein, and thinks the *ea*, *eo*, of the former no improvement on *ed*, *eo*, of the latter, for both give rise to misconceptions, which can be avoided only by using combined types which would permit the circumflex to be placed over both vowels together. He objects too to Zupitza's use of *j* for *i* before vowels, and of *g* for *ȝ*, for the letter *g* represents in A. S. "also" the guttural or palatal spirant, and he combats Zupitza's views on this point. He thinks the edition shows a real advance in the marking of quantities, but still takes exception to some words, as to whose quantity he differs from Zupitza. Moreover, Zupitza writes *weōx* as analogous to *sceōp*, a breaking then—as others think—but Sievers says no such form as **wox* ever occurs: *weaxan* is therefore a reduplicating verb, and to be consistent Zupitza should write *weōx*. The grammarians are not at one on this point, but most of them put *weaxan* in the same class with *sceōpan* (March's IV). Sievers criticises some of the words in the glossary, but praises the definitions and the exact references. He commends, on the whole, the representation of the text itself, but suggests some emendations, and finally differs from the editor in respect to his use of punctuation. Notwithstanding these minor criticisms, scholars everywhere will be grateful to Zupitza for such a cheap and handy edition of one of the most noted A. S. poems.

M. Trautmann closes the number and volume with a notice of some schoolbooks for instruction in English, by H. Plate, R. Degenhardt, W. Gesenius, and I. Schmidt, and makes some remarks on a better method for instruction in the phonology of the modern languages, in which he finds all grammars totally unsatisfactory. His remarks conclude with an autograph table of the arrangement of the "vowels, consonants, and middle-sounds," according to his method.

The second volume of the *Anglia* will be noticed in a future number of the *Journal of Philology*.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REVUE ARCHÉOLOGIQUE.

Juillet, 1879.

I. C. Henry, Sur l'origine de quelques notations mathématiques (Suite).

II. E. Revillout, Le Roman de Setna (Suite).

III. Maurice Albert, Sur une villa de Tusculum. In the region of Tusculum, so frequently explored, Albert discovered this villa, not by accident but observation. So excellent a building site as a large platform on a piece of rising ground could hardly have been neglected in this populous region. He searched and found. Exploration, however, was prevented by modern occupation. He discovered—1) A marble disc—one of the already known medallions, which, sculptured on both sides, were used as decoration, being *a*) hung from the ceiling, or *b*) pivoted on a standard between the columns of a portico. Gerhard was wrong in considering them votive shields. Their true use is shown in paintings of Herculaneum. This mode of decoration is peculiar to villas of the first century of the Empire. 2) A tomb close to the wall of the house. This situation of graves close to the house is not uncommon in this region. Under a funereal lamp was an *as*, the *fee* of Charon, and by the side of the lamp a tooth, a common thing in graves. The lamp was undecorated, and this plainness is a mark of funereal lamps of the first century of the Empire. 3) In the sarcophagus of a grave not far from the villa was a marble pillow with two hollows in it for the head and neck.

IV. Ferdinand Bompais, Drachme inédite frappé dans l'Étrurie. The woodcut shows on one side a hippocampus and dolphins, on the other is Cerberus. The place of finding is unknown. Bompais' interpretation is that *a*) Hippocampus and dolphins are an allusion to the maritime position of the city which issued the coin, *b*) Cerberus alludes to a cult of infernal deities in the city. The type of Cerberus on coins is extremely rare, only three other cases being known to Bompais. In two cases there was a sanctuary of infernal deities near the city, and in the third some such relation is conjectured. 1. Coin from Elea in Epirus near Acheron and Cocytus. Here was a Plutonium, according to Pouqueville. 2. From Cumae near Lake Avernus. At Cumae, according to Scymnus of Chios (v. 235-240) was a Cerberium. Strabo speaks of a Nekyomanteion in ancient times. 3. At Smyrna was found a Cyzicene. V. Barclay Head thinks it was struck in Cimmerium of the Cimmerian Bosphorus because *a*) it was in constant trade with Cyzicus, whence probably the denomination *b*) the ancient name of Cimmerium was Cerberium, whence, probably, the Cerberus. From these considerations Bompais conjectures that near the city in which our piece was coined was the shrine of a chthonic deity.

Is there an Etruscan city whose coins bear similar emblems of the gloomy side of mythology? Such are some of the coins commonly attributed to Populonia. 1. *Chimaera* (horned lion, tail tipped by dragon's head, no goat's head on the back). 2. The *Gorgoneion* on several coins, symbol of either *a*) death, which would suit our purpose, *b*) the moon (which would not illustrate our coin) in allusion to the city's name, which in its Etruscan form is PVPLVNA. 3. *Sphinx* on several coins. 4. *Cuttlefish*, on several, which Bompais takes to be *a*) the Lernean Hydra, *b*) at the same time an allusion to the position of the city on the sea. These terrible beings of mythology correspond to the Cerberus

on one side of our coin. The maritime situation of Populonia agrees with the hippocampus and dolphin on the other. Pliny (3, 8) says Populonia was the only maritime city of the Etruscans, but this does not help us to fix the home of our coin, for Strabo (5, 2, 8) names many other Etruscan towns on the coast.

V. E. Müller, Cure-oreille d'or byzantin portant une inscription grecque. It is twelve centimeters long. The inscription in six lines on six faces begins with a Greek cross, which is found in all Byzantine inscriptions, even those which, like ours, are not of Christian contents.

¶ 'Υγέν | ονσα χρ | ω, κυρᾶ. Κ | αλῶν κε | ρῶν ἀπο | λαίσης (no + subscr.).
Salva utere, domina. Felicibus temporibus fruaris.

The Abbé Martigny (Dict. des antiq. chrét., 1865, p. 467) cites among objects found in Christian graves, wigs, toothpicks and earpicks. In regard to earpicks he is wrong, the object referred to on a plate from Boldetti being an earring. *χρῶν* and Latin *utere* are common on jewels offered as presents. *ιγίατε* is in several funeral inscriptions, but no other jewel is known to Müller as having it. *καλῶν καιρῶν ἀπολαίσης* is a wish not found on any other remains of this kind. *ἀπολαίσης* in the future¹ (*sic*) is justified by *καιρῶν* which contains a future notion. *ε* for *αι* in *ιγίανοντα* and *κερῶν* is an ancient and abundantly attested change in spelling following a change in pronunciation. Thus on a lamp is ΑΙΓΕΑΙ-ΠΑΓΑΘΩ which has been wrongly read by Rayet *ἀπτέα ἵπτ* or *ἐπτ* *ἀγαθῷ*, rightly by Le Blant *ἀπτέ ἐπτ* *ἀγαθῷ*. What is its age? We may assign it to the tenth century A. D., because the shapes of the letters are exactly like those on coins of Constantine Monomachus and his successors.

VI. P. de Cessac, Découverte d'un cimetière des premiers siècles de notre ère. Planches—XV. Disque en marbre. XVI. Monnaies Étrusques.

Août, 1879.

I. F. Bompois, Remarques critiques sur les monnaies à revers lisse attribuées à Populonia. Bompois combats two opinions widely received among numismatists, and maintains:

1. That gold and silver coins are not from Populonia only. The thesis that Populonia was the only town of central Italy to strike coins of gold and silver, the others using only copper, Bompois disproves by adducing two gold and five silver coins with inscriptions which have not been and cannot be read Populonia.

Note.—On one coin is a wheel. Its form is very rare and is not found among any Greek people, but only on Etruscan and Thraco-Macedonian coins. In this Bompois sees proof of a common origin of the two races, Herodotus seeming to say that the Tyrrhenians of Crestona were of one origin with Etruscan Pelasgians (I 57, 94). [Compare Cortona in Etruria]. According to Strabo Caere was founded by Pelasgians from Thessaly. Now Thessaly is not far from Thrace.

2. That coins with plain reverse are not from Populonia only. Coins with plain reverse are peculiar to Etruria. The opinion long and widely held by

¹Aor. subj. used in late Greek as an optative. See Sophocles Lex. Introd. p. 46 2.—B. L. G.

numismatists that these coins were struck by Populonia alone among Etruscan cities is attacked by Bompais. He bases his objection on the great variety of types, so numerous that they could hardly have been the mintage of one city. He adduces coins bearing human heads, Hermes' head, Silenus' head, Gorgon, chimera, cuttlefish (which he calls hydra), hippocampus, a sea monster, lion heads, wild boar, hare, dog, owl, and wheel.

II. Auguste Castan, L'Épitaphe de la prêtresse gallo-romaine Geminia Titulla. Geminia. Titulla | Arauenensis. Mater | Sacrorum. Hic | Adquiescit — D.(ecimus) Jul.(ius) P(ublii) L(ibertus) Auctus Con(jugi) Pi | issimae. Et Aurae | Severi. Quem. Pro. F(ilio) | Obser(vavit.) "Here lies Geminia Titulla of Orange, Mother of the Holy Services. Dec. Jul. Auctus, freedman of Publius, to his faithful and beloved wife and to Aura (wife) of Severus whom he had adopted." Found at Besançon (anc. Vesontio). Date probably third century A. D. The most important element is the priestess' title of *mater sacrorum*, known, so far as Castan is aware, only in one other instance, an inscription from Bordeaux. From this Bordeaux inscription and two others near Besançon, Castan is inclined to regard the title as peculiar to Gaul and to the worship of Mercury, the greatest god in Gaul. On the other hand it may belong to the Taurobolic worship (of Mithras and the Mother of the Gods united), the pontiffs of which bore the title *pater sacrorum*.

III. Ed. Garnier, L'hôtel de Soubise.

IV. Eug. Muntz, Notes sur les Mosaiques chrétiennes de l'Italie (Suite). Planches—XVII—XVIII. Monnaies Étrusques. XIX. Objets trouvés dans les tumuli de Lunkofen.

Septembre, 1879.

I. J. Quicherat, Une tombe plate dans l'église de Sainte-Praxède à Rome.

II. A. S. Murray, La frise orientale du Parthénon. The frieze of the Parthenon shows a procession.¹ On the west wall is the preparation. Thence proceed eastward two lines on the north and south walls. On the east wall, the heads of the two lines having turned the corners, advance toward one another. In the centre of the eastern frieze are five standing figures, two officiants and three acolytes. On the right of this sacerdotal group are six larger figures seated, supposed to be gods, facing the procession that advances from the south. On the other side of this sacerdotal group are six other seated figures of gods facing the procession that advances from the north. The theory of Murray is as follows: These are not two separate parts of one ceremonial, they are one procession marching two abreast. The sculptor wished to direct the action upon one point. He accordingly divided the procession into two parallel lines on the north and south walls on either side of the spectator. On the east wall, which faces the spectator, perspective, which preserves reality, is denied the sculptor. The scene he had in his mind for the eastern wall was—the head of the procession halted in front of the spectator, further on the sacerdotal group, and in the distance the twelve gods facing the procession and the spectator. The sculptor has put the sacerdotal group in the centre of the frieze, half of the gods on one side of it, half on the other, and one file on each side, each six gods turned sideways toward a file.

¹ See Müller Denkmäler der alten Kunst, I 23.—A. D. S.

III. F. Bompois, *Remarques critiques sur les monnaies à revers lisse attribuées à Populonia (Suite)*. 1. Etruscan monetary units. Bompois combats the opinion of the Duc de Luynes that the Etruscan coins followed the old Euboean drachma of 3975 grammes. This has been disproved at length by Vazquez Quipo (Rev. Numism., 1850, p. 180 ff.). There were, says Bompois, two contemporary units in Etruria. The first and oldest was derived from the Attic, which, in the time of Kleisthenes, was about 4300 gr. The second, as proved by Mommsen (Hist. de la Monn. rom. I 218 ff.), was the Persian, the unit of which was the silver stater of 5440 gr. The existence of two units of these values is proved by Bompois by means of the weights of many coins. 2. XX, X, V (or Λ), II Λ do not denote values in drachmae. Mommsen's opinion is that the above figures on Etruscan coins denote multiples of drachmae, each being the double of the next following—2 dr., 1 dr., $\frac{1}{2}$ dr., $\frac{1}{4}$ dr. Bompois shows that whatever they mean they do not denote values. He cites a large number of coins which, though of the same weight, differ in their choice of the above figures.

IV. H. Thédenat, *Sur un cachet d'oculiste découvert à Reims*. One of the many Roman oculists' stamps or seals with inscriptions containing prescriptions of certain physicians for certain diseases of the eye. The inscriptions of our stamp are on the four edges. 1. M(arci) Cl(audivi) Martini di'acho.(les) ad. leu(coma): Diacho(les): salve of gall ($\delta\alpha\chi\lambda\eta\zeta$). Leu(coma): white spot on the cornea. 2. M(arci) Filoniani penicil(lum) le(ne) a(d) l(ippitudines). Penicillum: sponge. 3. M(arci) Cl(audivi) Martini authem(erum) lene. Authem(erum): probably, cure within twenty-four hours. 4. M(arci) Cl(audivi) M.

V. F. von Pulsky, *Monuments de la domination celtique en Hongrie. Planches—XX. Tombe plate. XXI. Figures de la frise orientale du Parthénon*.

A. D. SAVAGE.

HERMES. *Zeitschrift für classische Philologie*, unter Mitwirkung von A. KIRCHHOFF, TH. MOMMSEN, J. VAHLEN, herausgegeben von EMIL HUEBNER. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1879. Vol. XIV.

No. 1. In this number there is a paper by J. G. Droysen On the time of the Nemean festival. The conclusion is that it took place once in two years, summer and winter alternately, but no distinct result seems attainable from the meagre and late evidence that we possess.

Theodore Mommsen discusses the Roman Guards. The *praetoria cohors* was first instituted by the younger Scipio in the war against Sertorius and Numantia. It was not, then, a foundation of Roman imperialism. Under the empire there were nine cohorts of 1000 men each, whose pay was double that of the common legionaries. The four *cohortes urbanae* constituted a separate troop from the praetorians. Mommsen gives a noteworthy Inscription (C. I. L. VI 2725), recording the career of a soldier who passed from service in a legion to the praetorian guards, and afterward passed twenty-three years among the *evocati* as *architectus armamentarii imperatoris* under Domitian, Nero and Trojan.

Mommsen gives another and purely linguistic paper in this number, discussing the question how Greek φ, "the sweetest of the Greek letters," was represented in Roman writing. 1) The old way was by simple *p*, just as *t* and *c* were given of *θ* and *χ*. 2) from 250 B. C. on by *ph*, except that the less cultured often continued to write their *p*. 3) by *f* under Severus and afterward, noticeable especially in the Latin writing of Greek proper nouns. Coins and first-class official documents generally retain the *ph*, but after the middle of the fourth century A. D., this too begins to change, emperors calling themselves *triumfatores*, *Filippus*, etc., when *f* seems to have become the rule of orthography. In conclusion, Mommsen very properly warns scholars against drawing inferences as to laws and rules from the errors and blunders of individual inscriptions.

Ernest Curtius contributes a paper on Sparta and Olympia. He reasserts his views on the relation of Sparta to the sanctuary at Olympia, which have been recently opposed by Busolt, and points out the *political* significance of the alliance. Sparta, being the first of the Peloponnesian communities to acknowledge the Olympian sanctuary, ever after used the moral influence thus acquired for the sustenance and increase of her own political leadership in the Peloponnesus and beyond it. The relation of Delphi to Olympia is also discussed.

J. Olshausen of Berlin, who has done much toward tracing the linguistic influence of the Orient on the Occident in ancient times, has a minor paper on *στέρπαξ*, *storax*, tracing the Syrian *resin*, cultivated also in Crete, Boeotia, etc., to the name of the Syrian goddess *Astarte* אַשְׁתָּה.

No. 2. Parerga, by Von Wilamowitz of Greifswald. This is a long series of conjectural emendations of Greek texts, largely from the lyrical writers, from Alcman and Xenophanes down to Callimachus; also from the tragic writers and Aristophanes. Some of these emendations are striking and a few seem plausible, such as Anacreon (fr. 18 Bergk), *χείρεσσιν μαγάδην έχων*, and Pindar Nem. 9, 28, *τακτάν* for *ταίταν*.

Von Wilamowitz also has a paper on Phaedon of Elis. This is an attempt to suggest the contents of the lost dialogue entitled Simon, by Phaedon the Socratic. W. draws hints from the twelfth of the Pseudo-Socratic letters, that true virtue could very well take a middle position between those of Antisthenes and Aristippus.

Von Wilamowitz has a third paper on the Galliambi of Callimachus and Catullus. W. suggests that the Galliambus was first extensively used by the Greek poets of the beginning of the third century B. C., and most skilfully by Callimachus of Cyrene; and that Catullus' poem on Attis is not so much a translation as an imitation of the Callimachean Galliambi.

J. Vahlen of Berlin, the successor of Haupt, contributes a paper on Plato Philebus 25, D. E.: *συμίζων δέ γε εἰς αὐτὴν τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα κ.τ.λ.*, his interpretation being occupied especially about *καταφανῆς κάκειν γενήσεται*. Throughout he opposes any change of the received text, and, in opposition to Badham, denies the necessity of any emendation. Vahlen's remarks on the *impersonal* use of *δράσει* will interest Greek grammarians generally (cf. p. 210 sq.).

C. A. Lehmann of Berlin, gives a number of emendations of passages in Ciceronian orations.

H. Fiedke writes on the relation between the caesura and the accent in the hexameter of Nonnus.

H. Schrader of Hamburg, *Porphyrius bei Eustathius zur Boeotia*, discusses what Eustathius derived from the Homeric books of the Neoplatonist Porphyrius, and through what channels; he also attempts to identify other notes in the Homeric Scholia as Porphyrian, where the name of P. is not given.

J. Draheim of Berlin, *De Arte Ovidii*, discusses a peculiar metrical habit of Ovid in his practice of elision.

Robinson Ellis of England, *Emendationes Inscriptionum*, refers to the collection of epigrams recently published by Kaibel.

A. Jordan of Wernigerode, in an article, *Zur Kritik der spaeteren Platoniker*, discusses some of the MSS. containing commentaries of later Platonists, and points to a Vienna MS. (*Philos. Graec.* No. 314), as the leading one in value.

H. Jordan of Koenigsberg, the noted classical scholar and archaeologist, under the comprehensive title of *Vermischte Bemerkungen*, presents four distinct minor papers. 1) An emendation of Frontinus (*de aquis*). 2) A discussion of Horace, Ode IV 8, *Donarem pateras*. Here he makes a spirited and suggestive defence of the received reading, esp. of v. 13, *non incisa notis marmora publicis*. 3) Discusses two Pompeian wall-paintings of trifles, containing rather faint inscriptions (an address of a letter, and distichs). J. attempts a restoration. Corrupt forms in the conversational Latin of the period may be of interest to the general scholar: *cucus=quisquis, periat=pereat, valiat=valeat*. 4) A critical paper discussing Simonides of Amorgos, the satirical poem on women, by J., assumes several interpolations, of which he makes out the principal one to be from vs. 94 to the end.

H. Haupt of Würzburg, being engaged in a comprehensive study of the Byzantine historians, contributes the third and last of a series of papers concerning the extracts of Planudes, supposed by some to be derived from Dio Cassius.

In the remainder of this number are minor notes, of which we give some of the titles: On Ketriporis of Thrace, by Dittenberger of Halle. A misunderstood expression of Heraclitus, by E. Petersen of Dorpat. The Priapus-elegy of Tibullus, by the Editor. On Pausanias, an archaeological communication, by C. Robert of Berlin. On Stobaeus' *Florilegium*, by P. Thomas of Ghent, etc., etc.

No. 3. Johannes Schmidt of Rome, *On the Evocati*, a contribution to Roman antiquities. The *Evocati* (*οἱ ἀνάκλητοι*) were a special select grade in the non-commissioned Roman military, being found as a distinct feature principally from Augustus into the third century A. D. They were picked men invited to further service after having completed their *stipendia*. They seem to have been mostly of the praetorians. Schmidt has made extensive use of the inscriptions of the imperial era.

R. Hirzel of Leipzig, *Democritus' Schrift περὶ εὐθυμίης*, a very extensive paper (pp. 354-407). Hirzel traces the influence of Democritus' treatise, *π. εὐθ.*, in Seneca *de tranquillitate animi*, and finds further hints about its contents in the Pseudo-Hippocratean correspondence, and in the polemic against Democritus which he claims to find in Plutarch *περὶ εὐθυμίας*. He holds it probable that at the time of Cicero, of Horace, of Juvenal and of Clement of Alexandria, it was the only ethical treatise of Democritus which was read and preserved in its integrity. He attempts to assign to the treatise *περὶ εὐθυμίης* many other Democritean fragments which are preserved under other titles in extant

collections (Mullach). The well-known traditions of Democritus as the "laughing philosopher," and of the stupidity of the Abderites, he traces to the indirect influence of this same treatise.

Benedict Niese of Marburg, writes on Thukydides bei Stephanus, producing several corrections of the MS. from Stephanus of Byzantium: 'Αφροδιτία for 'Αφροδισία (IV 56), Κυνουρίας for Κυνοσουρίας (ibid.), Μεταπίοντ for Μεσσαπίοντ (III 121), and the insertion of καὶ Ἀμφίλοχοι after ὁ ποτε Ἀκαρναῖος (III 105). In all these passages the tradition of Thucydides in Stephanus seems really to be superior to that of the Thucydidean MSS.

H. Haupt continues his discussions of the fragments of Dio Cassius.

C. A. Lehmann of Berlin, in his *Questiones Tullianae*, continues his critical remarks on Ciceronian passages.

M. Niemeyer of Berlin, *Zu Plautus*, offers critical remarks on *Asinaria* 105 [adding *tum*], *Captivi* 463, *Capt.* 21, 22, *Asin.* 280, *Mercator* 312, *Miles* 1162, *Stichus* 313 foll.

Fr. Novati of Pisa, reports on a list of Aristophanic plays contained in the MS. at Milan (Cod. Ambrosianus). The number given is forty-four. The pieces given in the list as having had two editions are *Αἰολοσίκων*, *Θεσμοφοριάζοντας*, *Νεφέλαι*, *Πλοῦτος*. Various corrections of Suidas' article on Aristophanes result from the list in this MS.

E. G. SIHLER.

ATHENAION.¹ The *Athenaion*, edited by PROFS. KUMANUDIS and KASTORCHIS, is one of the best and most solid periodicals published in Europe. It is now in its eighth year, and in spite of the limited number of its subscribers, increases in interest and value. Besides numerous articles on philological subjects, it contains excellently digested accounts of all new excavations and discoveries. From recent numbers, I glean the following notes of recent excavations in Greece:

1. The Rock-Tombs at Nauplia. In two passages of his Geography, Strabo makes mention of caves in the neighborhood of Nauplia (*hod. Navplion*). Judging from his words, they must have been of considerable dimensions: ἐφεξῆς δὲ τῇ Ναυπλίᾳ τὰ σπήλαια καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς λαβύρινθοι, Κυκλώπεια δὲ δύομάζονται, H, 6, p. 369 *ad init.*; καὶ ίσως τὰ σπήλαια τὰ περὶ τῇ Ναυπλίᾳν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς ἔργα τούτων (i. e. τῶν Κυκλώπων) ἐπάνυμο ἔστιν, p. 373 *ad init.*

In August, 1878, Prof. Kastorhīs of Athens, being on a visit to Nauplia, took occasion carefully to excavate and examine certain small caves, which have long been known to exist in the neighborhood. He found them nine in number and situated on the N. E. slope of the fortress hill, Palamidi, close by the suburb Pronoia. It seems to have been taken for granted by archaeologists that these are the *σπήλαια* mentioned by Strabo; but inasmuch as they do not at all correspond to his description, it has been supposed that he wrote from hearsay and was thus inaccurate. Though this is quite possible, it would hardly be safe, with our present knowledge, to affirm that there did not exist in

¹Αθήναιον, σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν κατὰ διηγήσαν ἐκδιδόμενον συμπράξει πολλῶν λογίων. Ἀθήνησιν, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Ἐμούσιον.

Strabo's time, or even that there do not exist now, caves of much larger dimensions than those found, and capable of containing labyrinths, whatever that term may mean.¹ All that we can say is, that the ancients were acquainted with caves in the neighborhood of Nauplia, and that caves are still to be found there. Those examined by Prof. Kastorchis were, with one exception, turned toward the north, and resembled in form the so-called treasures at Mykēnae, or still more the tombs discovered at Spata (Σφραγίδες?) in the Mesogia, some three years ago. They were, however, much smaller than either, and had all been previously opened and robbed of their contents. Toward the end of September two other tombs were found in the same neighborhood, one of them apparently untouched. In this were found four skeletons, one large vase and eleven small ones, six human images closely resembling those found by Dr. Schliemann at Tiryns and Mykēnae (vid. Mykēnae, plates A, B, C), one image of an ox, and three sea-shells. There is nothing to show that the bodies in these tombs had ever been subjected to the action of fire. The tombs themselves are of various sizes and shapes, but none of them, apparently, are more than ten feet square or seven high. Some are square, some nearly round, some have the ceiling and doorway arched, others have two sides of the ceiling meeting at an angle and the top of the doorway horizontal. There can be little doubt a very large number of tombs still remain untouched on the slope of Palamidi, and that when these are thoroughly investigated by the Greek Archaeological Society, which has undertaken regular excavations, fresh light will be thrown upon the question of an early Egyptian settlement in the Argolid. Pausanias (IV 35, 2), as is known, tells us: ήσαν δὲ οἱ Ναυπλιεῖς, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, Αἴγυπτοι τὰ παλαιότερα παραγενόμενοι δὲ ὅμοι Δαναῷ ναοῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀργολίδα νοτερον γενεῖς τρισὶν ἵπδ Ναυπλίου τοῦ Ἀμυνάνης κατῳσθησαν ἐν Ναυπλίῳ.

2. The Rock-Tomb at Acharnae. During the months of April, May and June last, an arched rock-tomb, very similar to those at Spata, and discovered some six years ago close by Menidhi (the ancient Acharnae), was excavated by the German Archaeological School of Athens, of which Dr. Ulrich Köhler is the head. In it were found a large number of articles in gold, silver, bronze, ivory, stone, glass, terra-cotta, etc., having an unmistakable kinship with those found at Mykēnae and Spata. There was discovered neither iron, coin, nor inscription, and, what is very remarkable, not a single image in clay. This seems to furnish a decisive proof of what was previously suspected, viz.: that the treasures found in the tombs of Mykēnae belong to a different people from that which owned the rude clay images found in the earth above them, and that Greece in early times had a Middle Dark Age.

3. The Dipylon Gate in Athens. The Greek Archaeological Society, in spite of the many difficulties thrown in its way, has for months been pursuing

¹ There is especial difficulty in identifying the caves described by the ancients. Pausanias describes one in the neighborhood of Marathon thus (I 32, 7): δέλιγον δέ ἀπωτέρω τοῦ πεδίου Πανός ἐστιν ὅρος καὶ σπήλαιον θέας ἀξιῶν ἔσοδος μὲν ἐξ αὐτὸς στενή, παρελθόντος δέ εἰσιν οἴκοι καὶ λοντρά καὶ τὸ καλούμενον Πανὸς αἰπόλιον, πέτραι τὰ πολλὰ αἰξῖν εἰκασμέναι." Lolling (Mittheil. des deutschen Archæol. Inst. in Athen., Vol. I, p. 72, sqq.), makes these words apply to a cave on a hill near Ninoi (Οινόν). I examined this cave with great care, and find it impossible to believe that it ever contained οἴκοι or λοντρά. It has three εἰσοδοι, all equally στεναί. Possibly the cave of Pan has not yet been discovered.

excavations near the Dipylon to the east of the Hagia Trias, and has succeeded in laying bare a considerable portion of the ancient city wall, in an excellent state of preservation, sixteen layers high, and lacking, apparently, nothing but the embrasures. It forms a right angle, of which one side runs to the north and the other to the west. A portion also of the outer wall of the fosse was found, and remains of houses outside of it.

4. Eleusis and Delphi. The same society, having bought up a large number of the houses that at present occupy the sites of Eleusis and Delphi, are preparing to buy the remainder, and then to commence excavations in both places. The inhabitants are glad of the opportunity thus offered them of parting advantageously with their property, and removing elsewhere. The beautiful, large basin into which the fountain of Kastalia flows, has recently been cleared of the stones and mud that encumbered it, and is found to be almost uninjured, in spite of the frequent earthquakes.

5. The Lion of Chaironeia. This noble work of ancient sculpture, far superior to the famous Thorwaldsen lion at Lucerne, has for many years lain in fragments close to its pedestal. The Greek Archaeological Society is now taking measures to put the colossal fragments together and restore the monument of Greece's downfall to its original position.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

NEUE JAHRBUCHER FÜR PHILOLOGIE U. PAEDAGOGIK, herausgegeb. v. FLECKEISEN
u. MASIUS, 1879.

No. 7. H. Müller-Strübing of London, Concerning the battle of Marathon. This paper, the writer says, was suggested to him by Wecklein's *Ueber die Tradition der Perserkriege*, Munich Academy, 1876. He corrects or criticises the Herodotean and Plutarchean tradition in several points, maintaining especially: 1) That it was not the tribe *Aeantis* which had the position on the right wing, but the *Oenëis*, Miltiades' own, although the latter, as commander-in-chief, had a position in the centre. 2) He disbelieves the narrative that the Athenian army marched back to the city on the day of the battle. This view is based on physical and topographical considerations.

Ch. Herwig of Elberfeld, Concerning the question of *responsio* in Aeschylus, Agamemnon 1331-1343. The writer arranges thus: *a* (1331-1334), *β* (1335-37), *β'* (1338-1340), and *α'* (1341-43), the fourth and last *σύστημα* being interrupted by the cry of Agamemnon from the palace. To make things tally, he inserts in vs. 1343, *καὶ*; *καὶ τάδ' ἀκόνων*.

Fr. Kern of Stettin, discusses a number of passages in Sophocles' Antigone. He suggests a lacuna of one verse between 23 and 24, explains and defends ὁρθῶς *φίλη* in 99, recommends some alteration of *παντὸς ἀνδρὸς* in 175, as *παντὶ τάνδρός*; proposes a slight change in 743: *οὐ γὰρ δίκαι', ἀ σ' ἔξαμαρτάνονθ' ὥρῳ*, and takes umbrage at *πᾶσ'* in 776. His last suggestion is *ἐτ' ἔσχάτον* v. 853, for *ἐτ' ἔσχατον*.

A. Dederich of Emmerich, presents a number of emendations in Livy XXI, twenty in all. This paper deserves the careful reading of all students of Livy. The author is an old teacher of long experience, recently retired. His command

of the critical material seems very complete, and he frequently points out in a very instructive manner the genesis of corruptions. The space destined for these reports forbids an elaborate discussion of Dederich's readings. Still, as many teachers read Livy XXI with classes, it may be serviceable to note at least the passages discussed: c. 3, *In Hasdrubalis locum—sequebatur*; c. 5, *non petisse Saguntinos, etc.*, where D. reads *iungendis quoque* instead of *iungendoque*; c. 7, *oriundi a Zacyntho . . . Rutulorum qui quondam generis*; c. 8, *oppidani ad omnia—non sufficiebant, he inserts postquam before multifariam*. In c. 10 he reads *Hanno egit: per deos, foederum arbitros ac testis, oratione suadentis, . . . monuisse; praedixisse se, etc.*; c. 17, *duas legiones Romanas et decem milia sociorum . . . Gallia provincia nondum* (instead of *eodem*) *versa in Punicum bellum habuit*. In this passage he makes great use of Polybius. c. 22, *tuendae maritimae orae*; c. 25, *nec, dum parumper in patentia loca ducebatur agmen apparuit hostis*; c. 28, *ut tum elephanti*. In c. 31 Dederich defends the received reading: *quod ea senatus principumque sententia fuerat*; c. 33, *partibus deversis e rupibus* (instead of *perversis rupibus*); c. 36, *iumenta secabant cum tabidam* (or *tabem*) *tum infimam . . . ingredientia nivem*, cf. Polyb. III 55; c. 38, *Taurini Hannibali proxima gens erat in Italiam degresso* (instead of *Galliae*); c. 40, *ac nihil magis vereor ne cui umquam, vos cum pugnaveritis, Alpes vicisse Hannibalem videantur*. c. 41, *neque regressus ad navis <satis tutus> erat*; c. 43, *dextra laevaque duo maria claudunt et nullam . . . navem habetis, vobis circa Padus, etc.* (instead of *habentibus*); c. 48, *iamque in loca altiora eaque tumulis impeditiora equiti* (or *equis*); c. 49, *extemplo a praetore et circa civitates missi legati tribunique, qui suos . . . intenderent, ante omnia Lilybaeum intueri iussi, ad paratum belli edicto proposito, ut . . . deferrent et . . . ne quis . . . facere et; perque omnem oram qui ex speculis prospicerent adventantem hostium classem, dimissi*; c. 52, *maior tamen quam hostium Romanorum fama victoriae fuit*; c. 59, *pugna raro magis ulla aequa aut utriusque partis <pari> perniciis clarior*.

There is another critical Latin paper by R. Unger, *Emendations to the Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, pp. 493-512.

No. 8. R. Meister of Leipzig, *Concerning the Chronology of Boeotian Vocalism*, mostly drawn from inscriptions in Ionic characters, from the beginning of the fourth century to the beginning of Roman sway in Greece, about 150 B. C. According to Meister, the retention of original *o* or *v*, or of *v* side by side with (later) *ov* indicates the fourth century; *v* for *o* belongs to the third; a mixture of common forms with Boeotian points to 200-150 B. C.

H. Stadtmüller of Heidelberg, and I. Kvicala of Prague, contribute criticisms of passages in Euripides, generally involving real difficulties; St. on fragm. 803, v. 4; Hippol. 638; Hercul. fur. 1151, fragm. 340; Alcest. 1134 and 827. Kvicala on Heracl. 133; Hercul. fur. 617; Ion 382 (defending the current reading); Bacchae 860; Phoenissae 845 sq.

W. Herbst of Halle, discusses critically seven passages in Thucydides, mostly such as have engaged critics a great deal before, and as such these passages may be here cited: 1, 25, 4, *περιφρονοῦντες δὲ αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ*; 1, 51, 1, *οὐχ δοας ἔωρων ἀλλὰ <καὶ> πλείους*; 1, 70, 1, *καὶ ἀμα <ἡμεῖς> εἰτερ τινές*; 2, 13, 1, *ἐπὶ κακῷ γε τῆς πόλεως γένοιτο <τοῦτο>*; 2, 15, 4, *τὰ γὰρ ἵερά . . .* The most important is 2, 35, 1, *καὶ μὴ ἐν ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ . . . πιστευθῆνται*. H. strikes out

πιστευθῆναι. This is plausible, and Herbst mentions that it had previously occurred to Van Herwerden without his knowledge. 2, 44, 1, *οἵς ἐνεδαιμονῆσαι . . . ξηρεμετρήθη.*

W. Gebhardi of Meseritz, *Zum ersten Buche von Vergilius Aeneis*, pp. 561-578.
1) vs. 653 sqq., he now reads:

præterea sceptrum Priami colloque monile
maxima natarum Ilione quod gesserat olim
bacatum et duplicum gemmis auroque coronam.

a change ably set forth and well defended. 2) vs. 395, the simile of the swans. 3) vs. 534, with a general discussion of incomplete lines in Vergil, he suggests a period after *hic cursus fuit*. 4) vs. 188, he brackets *fidus quae tela* *gerebat Achates*. 5) vs. 455 sqq., Aeneas beholding the pictures of Trojan scenes; Gebhardi insists that these verses are in a hopeless muddle. 6) An archaeological excursus on the pictures themselves, in which he insists that we must not think of sculptures as, for instance, Weidner does. 7) Purely exegetical on vs. 495. 8) Minor alterations: vs. 747, *ingeminent plausum*, vs. 729, *qua Belus*; 721, *pervertere*; 707, *lumina* instead of *limina*; vs. 646, *caro* instead of *cari*. The famous line, 574, he now reads thus: *Tros Tyriusve, mihi nullo discrimine agetur, "whether it be a Trojan or Tyrian, my action will not be determined thereby."* 9) Specimens of improvement in punctuation.

In the *Noctes Scholasticae* of this number there is a very suggestive and readable discourse on methods and aims of classical study at the German universities and on the professional preparation for classical teaching.

E. G. S.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. VII, Part II.—This number contains papers by Cobet, Badham, Francken, Van Herwerden, and Cornelissen. Besides giving three emendations for passages of Diodorus Siculus and two for Aulus Gellius, Cobet has an article of sixty-six pages on Cicero's Philippi. Forty-one of these are taken up with emendations and illustrations of the text, while the remainder of the article is devoted to a criticism of the trustworthiness of Cicero in regard to his statement of facts. It may be well to give some characteristic specimens of Cobet's textual criticisms:

Phil. II 3, 6. *Cum omnes impuritates IMPUDICA in domo susciperes vino lustrisque confectus.* Sic scribitur ex auctoritate Codicis Vaticani et Nonii Marcelli, quum sana ratio pudica postulet. Namque *pudica in domo* est in domo, quae Cn. Pompeii fuerat, *impudica in domo* est *in domo TUA*, in qua quum quotidie omnes impuritates susciperentur quam fatuum est addere *impudicam* illam domum fuisse. Comparandus es locus Philipp. II 25, 69 *quid enim umquam domus illa* (Pompeii) *viderat nisi pudicum, quid nisi ex optimo more et sanctissima disciplina?*

On Phil. II 9, 21, *tu illum* (Antonius Clodium) *in foro spectante populo Romano gladio insecutus es*, he repudiates the reading *spectante*, though taken by Halm *ex optimo codice* (Vaticano) saying "utrum quoque loco *spectare* an *inspectare* verum sit non pendet a libris sed a verborum intelligentia," and then goes on

to show that whereas *spectare* is applied to the being present at games and shows, *inspectare* is used by Cicero only in the ablative of the present participle, in such expressions as *inspectante me, nobis inspectantibus*. The word in the sentences quoted above should be therefore *inspectante* in the sense of *in conspectu populi, ante oculos populi, "habetque coniunctam notionem impudentiae cuiusdam et audaciae,"* and to confirm this he quotes (and happily does not merely refer to) several passages.

In Phil. II 14, 35, where the editions read *ad aedem Opis*, he insists on the omission of *aedem*, maintaining that in such cases the accusative or ablative is always to be omitted after *ad, ante, a, pone*, whereas "*in et pro* hanc ellipsis non admittunt aut non requirunt."

In Phil. II 18, 44, he desires to insert *is* after *Clodio* in the words "*intimus erat in tribunatu Clodio, qui sua erga me beneficia commemorat,*" explaining the sense required by *φίλατος ἦν τῷ Κλωδίῳ ὁ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ περὶ ἐμὲ εὐεργεσίας δημογόμενος.*

On III 11, 27, "*O C. Caesar, adolescentem appello, quam tu salutem rei publicae attulisti,*" he remarks: "*quae tandem est sententia verborum adolescentem appello? Cur adolescentem eum vocat? an ne cum patre confunderetur? absurdum hoc quidem est. Quid igitur dixerat? nempe O Cai Caesar, ABSENTEM appello; ut in Phil. I 13, 31. Tu autem, M. Antoni, absentem appello, unum illum diem—non omnibus autemponis?*"

In Phil. V 4, 10, he insists on writing *coloniis* for *colonis*, remarking, "*ineptum est in talibus aliquid libris credere. In Vaticano locis innumerabilibus I et II, 18 et 118 confusa videbis. Utra sit ubique lectio potior et vera nostri iudicii est.*"

On Phil. V 12, 31, where Halm has, in deference to the Vatican MS., omitted *afferemus*, while it is required by the sense, Cobet remarks: "*non quodlibet vocabulum per ellipsis recte omittitur, sed ea tantum quae legentibus vel audientibus certa statim in mentem venire debent: tam bonus gladiator rudem tam cito.*"

Phil. VII 6, 16, is emended in accordance with a passage in Suetonius, *Caes. 41*, in which reference Cobet is anticipated by Nipperdey, Philol. III, p. 145.

Phil. VIII 6, 19, he emends *quotidie aliquid iracundiae remittebat*, saying "*postulat Latine loquentium consuetudo ut rescribatur: quotidie aliquid DE iracundiA remittebat,*" citing several passages to show that in such cases *de or ex* is always used.

On Phil. X 3, 6, *legiones abducis a Bruto. Rursus igitur vis nudatum illum atque solum a re publica relegatum videri*, he remarks, "*quid sibi vult videri? Quid est? an δοκεῖν? an existimari? Nihil minus. Qui Brutum oderant eum copiis nudatum esse, non videri volebant. Emendata una literula legendum: vis nudatum viderE et ea re oculos pascere.*"

In Phil. X 7, 15, *qui C. Caesaris RES actas everti—volunt* he corrects *Caesaris ACTA*, saying "*res gestae usitate dicitur res actae non item.—RES post Caesaris ex dittographia natum est, deinde ACTA ad RES accommodatum in ACTAS est conversum.*

In Phil. X 8, 16, he desires to insert *non* before *acrius*, which seems unnecessary if its usual ironical force be allowed to the parenthetical *credo*.

But Cobet's passing remarks on the text of these orations are by no means confined to conjectural emendations of more or less probability. He anticipates

on occasion the purpose of the latter part of his article, by calling attention to the watchfulness with which Cicero's statements of fact must be scrutinized. As an example, he quotes from Phil. III 7, 17, Cicero's protests against the enormity of Antony's charging Q. Cicero the younger with a contemplated assassination of his father and uncle: *in eum adolescentem hoc scribere audere, quem ego et frater meus propter eius suavissimos atque optimos mores praestantissimumque ingenium certatum amamus omnibusque horis oculis, auribus, complexu tenemus.* And says, "haec omnia Cicero temporis causa mentitur; nam satis constat Quintum filium nequissimum nebulonem propter eius perditissimos et pessimos mores patri, patruo, et avunculo, Attico, odiosum admodum et invisum fuisse." And he then quotes a number of passages from the letters to Atticus by which this latter judgment is confirmed. The single letter (ad Att. XVI 5, 2), in which he speaks pleasantly of Quintus was a mere blind, "nihil in his veri est, nihil ex animi sententia dictum. Cicero qui nihil suis impudenter rogantibus negare poterat, in hac re astutus fuit et διπλοῦς ἀνὴρ." In another letter he tells Atticus that he has written before at the request of his brother and nephew. "ΕΑΕ ΝΕ ΤΕ ΜΟΒΕΡΙΝΤ." Cobet refers the credit of this discovery of Cicero's duplicity to Tunstall in his letter to Middleton. And in several other illustrations he adduces he has been forestalled by others. For example, on Phil. XII 2, 5, and XIII 1, 1 and 21, 49, he makes quotations, Greek and Latin, which are already in the notes.

The latter part of the article (pp. 154-179) is devoted to establishing that Cicero's statements as to Antony's atrocities and to the deference which Octavianus paid to the Senate, and other matters, are wholly untrustworthy. He says: "Multa Cicero odio incensus et inflammatus ira dixit, non nunquam de magnis maiora loquitur, interdum nimium tribuit auguriis suis rerum futurarum et quae eventura esse certo credebat vera et certa esse putavit: est etiam ubi temporis causa (plane et Latine dicam) mentitus est," and says further on that in his narrative Cicero followed his own rule, *de Orat. II § 241 si habeas vere quod narrare possis, tamen est mendaciunculis adspergendum.* To discredit Cicero's statements he relies mainly on Appian, and especially on a speech of Piso which is recorded by him; but he avails himself also of Cicero's own language in the letters to Brutus, of which he promises at some future time to establish the genuineness and authenticity. After quoting one patriotic passage from Phil. X 10, 20, he says, "verba haec sunt rebus contraria; illa Σ(entina) Ρ(opuli) Κ(uondam) Ρ(omanū) erat ad serviendum parata."

The next article is by Prof. Badham of Sidney, containing miscellaneous criticisms on the text of Plato's Philebus, Demosthenes, de Corona, Thucydides, lib. I and Euripides, Medea. A single specimen may be given. Dem. de Cor. § 147 εἰ μὲν οὖν τῆς ιδίας ἔνεκ ἔχθρας η τοὺς Θετταλῶν η τοὺς Θηβαίων συμπειθοι βαδίζειν ἐφ' ίμᾶς, οὐδένα ἥγειτο προσέξειν αὐτῷ τὸν νοῦν, ἐὰν δὲ τὰς ἔκεινων κοινὰς προφάσεις λαβὸν ἥγεμῶν αἰρεθῆ ἥσον ἥλπιζε τὰ μὲν παρακρούσεσθαι τὰ δὲ πεισειν. Ηαec non modo in grammaticam peccant (ει συμπειθοι ἥγειτο—ἐὰν αἰρεθῆ ἥλπιζε) sed plane falsa sunt et rei naturae contraria. Quid enim? nonne hanc ipsam ob causam fallaciis utebatur ut dux crearetur? Quod ut semel assecutus est deposita simulatione vi agere coepit. Quae vero sunt illa κοινὰ προφάσεις Thessalorum Thebanorumque? Si voluissent Atheniensibus bellum inferre nullius προφάσεως indigebant. Philippo contra necesse erat προφάσεις λαβεῖν

quibus hos in societatem adduceret. Quas ergo? nempe τὰ κοινά Thessalorum et Thebanorum. Scribendum igitur τὰ δέ ἑκένων κοινὰ προφάσεις λαβῶν (vel εἰ δέ τάκενων κοινὰ π. λαβοί) ἥσον ἥλπιζε τὰ μὲν παρακρούσεσθαι τὰ δὲ πείσεν.

A paper then follows by C. M. Francken on the Epidicus of Plautus. The first part of it is devoted to the discovery of additional evidence of the *duplex recensio* of the play as already demonstrated by Reinhardt and Goetz. This is one of his arguments. In 276 Periphanes is urged to feign a love for the music girl. Nothing comes of this; but in 415 it is said that she was induced to come to his house willingly because she supposed that she was to take part in the performances at a sacrifice. The latter is clearly a better motive. Therefore, vv. 276-280, belong to a first edition.

Again, in 314 Epidicus speaks of having received an order from Periphanes to hire a music girl to assist at a sacrifice. In 417, Apoecides, talking to Periphanes, mentions this as if it were "rem commenticiam." Therefore, 314 belongs to the prior recension.

In 500 the music girl tells Apoecides and Periphanes that she was hired to perform at a sacrifice. Here is no deception. But in 317 and 371 Epidicus tells Stratippocles that he will procure the girl to delude the old man. This discrepancy is to be accounted for by the same consideration. From 385 all goes on consistently; therefore we may infer that the former portion must belong to the unrevised edition.

After this discussion Francken proceeds to criticise various lines in the play and emend them. For instance, v. 65, which in B. J. read: THESP. Deperit. EPID. Detegetur corium de tergo meo, he suggests: Deperit. De tergo corium detegitur meo.

In 490, which Goetz gives: nam pró fidicina haec *cerva* suppositast tibi, Francken does not know whether it is intended to make allusion to the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and says: "eiusmodi reminiscentias in Plauto non temere admittendas." He thinks the letters of the MSS. suggest: nam pro fidicina vera haec suppositast tibi.

The next paper contains emendations of certain of Lucian's writings by Van Herwerden.

In Somnium, 4, he desires various changes, particularly proposing ἀνακτησαμένης δέ με τῆς μητρός for ἀγανακτησαμένης. In c. 13 he would read χιτωνίσκον ταῦτα instead of χιτόνιν τι, on the ground that we see from Lexiph. 35 that Lucian recognized the latter as being γυναικός ἐσθῆς. In the same passage he proposes κάγκωπέας for καὶ κοπέας, because the former was the word for "chisel" used in c. 3. In c. 18, he prefers τὰ ἡττω of Reitz to τὴν ἡττω of Jacobitz (though he would prefer to read τὰ χειρῶ), thus keeping φίσων as object of διαφεύγων.

In Nigrin, c. 24, πῶς γὰρ οἱ τὴν ψυχὴν διατείσθαι μοι, he proposes διατίθεσθαι, not only "quod illa forma non solet Lucian. cum faece Graeculorum uti pro διακεῖσθαι," but also because the present is more proper. In c. 37, τὸ βέλος—μένει τε καὶ πολὺ τοῦ φαρμάκου ἀρίστων, he proposes ἐμένειν and ἐνίησον, comparing Xen. Mem. I 3, 12, ἐνίησον γάρ τι τὰ φαλάγγια κατὰ τὸ δῆγμα.

In Iudicium Vocalium 2, where Σ complains of the neglect into which he is falling, and says that it is nearly come to this, that ἐν ίσῳ κεῖσθαι τοῦ φύσον, he proposes τῷ φύσῳ, referring to Plat. Theaet. 174 e, τό τε σίγμα τῶν ἀφύνων ἐστι, φύσος τις μόνον.

Similar criticisms are made on the Timon, Prometheus, Halcyon, and the Dialogi Deorum, Mortuorum, and Marini.

The last article is by J. J. Cornelissen, proposing emendations on Tibullus. The most probable of them seems to be this: II 5, 81, *Et succensa sacris crepitit bene laurea flammis, Omine quo felix et sacer annus eat*, where he proposes *satur* for *sacer*.

On I 10, 15, *Sed patrii servate Lares: aluistis et idem, Cursarem vestros cum tener ante pedes*, his comment is: *ridicule poeta se ipsum, tenellum infantem, cursantem facit ante Larium pedes. Ni autem fallor, scripsit curarer!*

C. D. MORRIS.

ROMANIA.—The following report aims at giving a brief summary of the more important articles contained in Nos. 30 and 31 of the Romania for 1879. Limited space would not allow anything more than a rough statement of the conclusions arrived at by the writers, nor has it been found practicable to discuss or criticise these conclusions except in a few instances.

No. 30 begins with an article by H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, entitled *Des rapports de la versification du vieil irlandais avec la versification romane*. After a brief examination of some of the most common types of Irish verse, the writer concludes that the facts obtained up to the present time contain nothing of sufficient importance to establish the supposed relations of Irish versification with the Romance. It is possible, he admits, that the versification of the prehistoric Irish may have followed the laws of that of the Gauls; but there is nothing to show that the laws of the former were identical with those of the old Irish versification. The revolution which, in modifying the language, destroyed the measure of the prehistoric verse, may have created a new system of versification. The laws of the old Irish verse, then, teach us nothing definite with reference to that of the prehistoric Irish. We cannot prove and are not justified in assuming, that the prehistoric Irish had either the quatrain, the verse of seven syllables, assonance or alliteration. We have no reason, therefore, to attribute to the Gauls the laws of versification of the old Irish. The Gauls must have possessed these laws themselves, in order to transmit them to the Provençal and French; but this is not proved. Moreover, if the Gauls had transmitted them to the Provençal and French, the latter would have observed them, which is not the case. The quatrain is not the fundamental principle of Provençal and French versification; alliteration is not one of its ornaments; nor has the verse of seven syllables the same importance in Provençal and French as in Irish. The writer further maintains that he finds nothing in the popular (*vulgaire*) versification of the Romans (in which it is thought the Provençal and French had its origin), that may be considered in his opinion as the type of the Irish quatrain.

L'imparfait du subjonctif en -es (provençal) by Paul Meyer. The imperfect of the subjunctive in Provençal has two terminations, *-es* and *-is*: *am-es* and *part-is*, which in certain provinces are lengthened to *amessa* and *partissa*. The author confines his examination to the former of these endings (*es*), and proceeds to show that, though identical in spelling, these verbal terminations are

quite different in sound, some having the narrow *e* (*e estreit*), others the wide *e* (*e larc*). The proof of this is to be found in the fact that certain of these endings nearly always rime with words known to contain the narrow *e* (*es*), while others rime with words having the wide *e* (*es*). Faidit, in his table of rimes, gives the following words under the rubric of *es larc*: *pes, confes, ades* and *pres*. From various poems of the troubadours, Meyer collects imperfect subjunctives that rime with these words, such as *chantes, mandes, celes, ames, tornes, nasques, trobes, adjudes*, etc. He then gives a number in the same tense from the Flamenca, as, for instance, *agues, conogues, degues, pogues*, which rime with each other or with words whose *e* is known to be narrow, either by their etymology or by the authority of Faidit. In this way we may account for those passages in this poem, where four consecutive lines end in *-es*. In such cases the rime is only apparent; the one couplet contains the wide *e*-rime, the other the narrow *e*; e. g., verses 6146-9. This distinction between *-es* and *-es* being thus established, it remains to ascertain the cause of this difference. The *-es* is produced only by verbs in *-er* and *-re*; the *-es* by a few in *-er* and *-re*, and always by verbs in *-ar*. Question is, to find the principle common to verbs in *-ar* and to the few in *-er* and *-re*, which have *-es* in the imperfect of the subjunctive. It is this: they all have the preterit in *-et*. The rule may be stated, then, thus: all verbs which form the third pers. sing. of the preterit in *-et*, give *-es* in the imperfect subjunctive. On the other hand, in verbs whose preterit does not end in *-et*, the force of the Latin termination *-issem* remains intact and gives *-es*. This rule seems to be so exact, that in those verbs of the second and third conjugations, which have two preterits (one in *-et*), there are two imperfect subjunctives, one in *-es*, the other in *-es*. Thus *respondre* makes *respondet* and *respos* and *respondes* and *resposes*. These distinctions are very generally observed in the rimes. It is only by negligent rimers after the thirteenth century and by foreigners, who wrote in the *langue d'oc*, that *-es* and *-es* are confounded and made to rime with each other.

La vie de Saint Alexi en vers octosyllabiques, ed. by G. Paris. Under this heading Gaston Paris published an old French poem, the date of whose composition, to judge from the versification, would fall somewhere near the latter part of the twelfth century. This poem was printed as early as 1856 in the *Mémoires de l'Académie de Caen*, but as this impression is now difficult of access, students of early French philology will be very thankful for the present reprint. Of the language of the poem, which consists of 964 lines, there is nothing very special to say. The author sometimes adds an *s* to nominatives, where none existed in Latin. Of more importance than this, is the use of the oblique case for that of the subject. Neither the dialect of the poem nor the copyist of the manuscript can be determined with any degree of certainty. The vocabulary as well as the style has a somewhat archaic cast at times, but the latter is usually very clear and simple, as the following lines, the prologue, will show:

Bone parrole boen leu tient;
Et cil qui l'ot et la retient
Et met a ovre fet que sage;
Et cil ne fet pas son demage
5 Qui la dit, enceis fet son preu
Vers Deu, qui en tens et en leu
Li merira, ge n'en dout rien:
Kar il guerredone tot bien.

Por ce m'es pris talant de dire
10 Un conte de bone matire
Por crestiens edifier,
Et pour ce que il m'est mestier
Que bone parole me tienge
Boen leu vers Deu, qui me meintienge
15 En son servise, et tel me face
Qui je le veie face a face.

Traité catalans de grammaire et de poétique is a continuation, by Paul Meyer, of various ancient treatises on grammar and the poetic art, which he began to publish in Vol. VI of the Romania for 1877. He then gave Las reglas de trobar of Raimon Vidal and Doctrina de compondre dictats. The present number contains the third of these treatises, which has as its title Doctrina de cort [d'acort]. It is a metrical version of the Razos de trobar of R. Vidal, and is the work of a Pisan, Terramagnino by name. As might be expected, it possesses but little interest or value as a grammatical treatise. The beginning of the Proema is somewhat amusing as applied to the subject to be treated :

En lo nom de Dieu qu'es subiranz,
Paire e fill e esperitz sanz,
E guidanz de totz pecadors.

Unfortunately his deity did not prove a *guidanz* to him ; for numerous sins are to be found in his pages. He does not always understand his model: is incapable of improving on him ; and where he departs from him, it is always to fall into error. The Pisan's chief originality lies in the examples cited by him from the troubadours in illustration of his rules. His definitions of the parts of speech are usually quaint, but at times quite pointed ; as in line 81, where, after stating that *emperayre*, *reys* and *baron* are substantives, he continues :

E totas otras qui en ver
Mostron substansa qui vezet
Se pot o qui vezet nos pot.

Strophes au Saint Esprit, etc. The manuscript here published for the first time, by Michel Cohendy and Antoine Thomas, belongs to the archives of the department of Puy-de-Dôme, and contains: 1) Des strophes en l'honneur du Saint Esprit; 2) Les statuts versifiés d'une confrérie du Saint Esprit; and 3) Une petite prière à la Vierge. The whole consists of 435 verses, in the Auvergnat dialect, as the editors assert. At the end, the copyist adds eight verses in French, stating that he completed his task on the 6th of July "l'an de grace mil cinq centz et sept" (1507). The work itself is of a much earlier date. Numerous forms would seem to indicate that its composition is to be placed somewhere in the thirteenth, possibly in the twelfth century. The Strophes au Saint Esprit are forty-two in number, of six verses each, and rime as follows: *a, a, a, b, a, b*; *b* is always a rime in *-it*, while *a*, with one exception, is always a paroxytone rime, e. g. :

Qui mal faict et lou ben sella,
Aquel s'art com ly chandela.
3 Tant sec l'arania la tella

Tro c'a lo corps consumit
Et lo sec tand no sen s'ela
6 Damnal corps et l'esperit.

The "statuts" are in riming couplets, while the "prière" rimes: *a, a, a, a, a, b, b, b, b, b*. The editors are very positive that the dialect is Auvergnat, and for this reason, because the manuscript was found at Saint-Julien de Coppel, near Billom, and because of the constant use of *ch* representing Latin *c* before *a*, the nominative feminine article *li* and *ly* and the notation *gh* for the soft sound of *g'(-d')* before *a* and *o*. To settle the dialect of a piece on such flimsy grounds is surely a most unscientific proceeding. A number of words in these pieces

are not contained in Raynouard's Lexique. *Atassa, acala, gauchat, anfara, agenda, jangot* are obscure as to their meaning; but the following are clear enough: *agualla*, inf. *aguular*—*égaliser* (Rayn. *angular*); *aünit*, inf. *aünir*—*réunir* (Rayn. *aünar*); *durmida*, fem. part.—*sleep*; *hostala*, inf. *hostalar*, to receive hospitality; and *revelhos* (*revel*), *rebellious, obstinate*.

Henry Carnoy gives a number of interesting *Contes*, *petites légendes*, *croyances populaires*, *coutumes*, *formulettes*, *jeux d'enfants*, which he collected at Warloy-Baillon (Somme) and Mailly. These are in a certain sense a continuation of the series of similar stories, etc., which he began to contribute to the *Mélusine* before it suspended.

Etymologies. J. Ulrich proposes a new class of participles formed on the model of *comestus* from *comère* (*comedere*). In this way he would derive *amon-estar* (Sp. and Prov.) from *monestus* (*monère*) and *carestia* from *carestus* (*carère*). (For the latter A. Tobler thinks the Gr. *ἀχαποτία* would suffice.) Ulrich further offers *disvadere* as the origin of *desver*, which, he says, may have first been modified by *du sens* (*desver du sens*), then have dropped the adjunct, and finally added the reflexive *se*. G. Paris, however, thinks this derivation questionable. Tobler had formerly proposed to explain *sancier* and *essancier* by *exemptiare*. As this would lead us to expect a form *essancier* and not *essancier*, Paris assumes a verb *sanitiare* from *sanitia* for *sanitas*. There is nothing to support this conjecture of Mr. Paris. No such post-classic form as *sanitia* is found; moreover, *sanitia* would not have given the substantive *santé*, but *sanesse*, which does not occur.

No. 31. The libraries of Cambridge, England, have not, up to the present time, furnished any material for the history of the French language and literature, although they contain numerous French manuscripts on a variety of subjects, dating from the twelfth century. *Chansons de geste*, poems of adventure, didactic poems, lives of saints and chronicles may all be found here in abundance; while the aid rendered to the student seeking information is said to be of the most cordial kind. Owing to the lack of suitable catalogues of these manuscripts, the search is somewhat difficult and discouraging; and this may account for the fact of Romance scholars having hitherto neglected Cambridge for Oxford, where the facilities are most ample. Mr. Paul Meyer, during the last eight years, has made frequent visits to Cambridge for the purpose of copying and bringing to light some of these treasures. It was his original intention to print the results of his labors in the *Archives des Missions*, but his matter having become too voluminous for the space allowed by the *Archives*, he has concluded to publish it in the *Romania*, No. 31 of which begins with the manuscripts of St. John's College Library. In selecting the works to be printed he has been guided by the wish to give only such as would throw some light on the history and development of the language. A prefatory note describing the manuscript and its place of deposit is affixed to each piece. There are represented four manuscripts (B. 9, F. 30, G. 5 and I. 11), which contain the following poems: [La Bonté des femmes]; Chrestien, Vie de S. Guillaume d'Angleterre; Description de la terre d'Outremer; Mirabilia Romae; Poésie en forme de pastourelle du 14 e. siècle; La petite philosophie; Pierre de Peckham; Les quinze signes; Le roman de la rose; La somme le Roi; Vie de Sainte Paule en prose; Wace, la Conception; and William de Waddington.

Mr. Gaston Paris gives a lengthy analysis and study of the *Roman du châtelain de Couci*. He aims to establish the name of the author of this *Roman*, which has not been heretofore made out. The poet himself states that his name is contained in a certain passage of twenty lines. Mr. Paris thinks this is an acrostic; and by shifting the initial letters about to suit his own fancy, he builds up the following most outlandish looking name: *Jakemon* (or *Jakeme*) *Sakesep*. No one will, of course, accept this, owing to the juggling process by which it is arrived at. Mr. Paris, however, in accordance with his usual dogmatism, is so certain that he is right that he continually refers to the poet by this name in the succeeding part of his article, which is occupied with an examination of the sources and historical basis of the *Roman*. It may be remarked that this article is to appear in the twenty-ninth volume of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, now in press.

Chute de l médiale dans quelques pays de langue d'oc. The falling out of medial *l*, so common in Portuguese, has been, for a long time, thought to be peculiar to that language and unique in the Romance languages; and this phenomenon was sought to be explained by local influence, either Basque or Iberian. In the *Romania* for 1877 (p. 396), Mr. Cornu called attention to a number of words, in the language of the Vallée de Bagnes, in which *l* between two vowels had been dropped. Mr. O. Nigoles has been studying this subject with reference to the langue d'oc, and he finds that, in some of its dialects, the disappearance of the medial *l* is quite common, at least in the language as spoken at the present day. Two classes of facts are noticed by him, which he states as follows: 1) *l* vocalisée est absorbée, dans le corps des mots, par le voisinage de *u*, venant soit de *ü*, *ü*, soit de *ö*, *ö*; 2) elle disparaît entre deux voyelles et à la fin des mots, mais pour une autre cause et en suivant une marche différente: la disparition de la liquide a été précédée du changement de *l* en *r*.

Before entering upon the special theme, he gives the general treatment of the letter under discussion. It is this: *l* initial remains intact; single *l* in the interior of words becomes *u* (*alam, auo*); when final, it is vocalized (*aprilem, obriou*), as also before labials, gutturals and *m, n* (*albam, auo: calcare, kouka; palmam, paumo; alenam, auno*); but before dentals and *r, s, z*, vocalization is rare (*altare, olta*); in this latter position it is so strong as to assimilate the following *d* (*excaldare, eskolla*); it becomes *n* by assimilation in *in altum—nall-nant*, and in *nos alteros—nantres*; *l* mouillée, however, is preserved but as a single *l* (*callosum, kulus*), likewise in diminutives in *-ellus, -ella*. Passing on from this general fate of the *l*, which I have but partially and briefly indicated, Nigoles comes to the discussion of the cases, where this letter disappears entirely. This discussion occupies thirteen pages, and, though exceedingly interesting, it cannot be given even in brief. A few instances must suffice. Preceded or followed by *u*, *l* disappears: *bodula, buo* (see *Diez Eym. Wört. II c. borne*); *talonem, tolu, tou*. This disappearance of *l* is probably due to its fusion with the *u*; so that it is hardly right for Nigoles to say that the treatment of *l* in *talonem, tolu, tou*, is essentially different from *albam, auo*. The *u* in *tou* may as well be the vocalized *l* as the other *u*. The majority of the instances cited by him seem to be susceptible of this explanation; e. g., atonic *ö, ö* becoming *u* in *in-solare* and *solatam*, we should have *esuua, esua* and *sulado, suuado, suado*. It may further be remarked that this falling out of the *l* is by no

means constant: *calorem, kour* and *kour*; *colorem, kulur*; *mulam, mulo*, etc. This study of Nigoles has been confined to the canton Saint-Amans-des-Cots and a part of Sainte-Geneviève.

Le Sacrifice d'Abraham, mystère engadinois, will be found of much interest to those who have not met specimens of this dialect before.

Of the new etymologies, those by Wedgwood may be noted as most plausible. *Agacer* from O. H. G. *hwassi*, M. H. G. *wasse*, an edge; hence to urge, to *egg* (A. S. *egc*—edge). M. H. G. *wetzen* conveys the same sense: "Sus begunde in *wetzen* unde reizen uf de tôt;" and Eng. *whet* is used in the same metaphorical way: "When she to murder *whets* the timorous thane." In Rabelais, *esguasser les dens* seems to point directly to some such derivation as *wasse*. In support of the derivation of *blaireau* from *bladarius*, a corn-dealer, he offers a passage from Herrick to show that the popular belief of the seventeenth century regarded the *badger* as a hoarder of grain: "Some thin chippings the mice filcht from the bin of the gray farmer."

Guignon, ill-luck, is commonly taken from *guigner*, to look askew. A more satisfactory origin may be found in O. E. *wanion*, chiefly used in the expression, *with a wanion!* synonymous with the Irish curse, *bad luck to you!*

In the Eng. argot of thieves, to stand in the pillory was to "peep through the nut-cracker," to play bo-peep. Catalan *espillera*, a loophole, may explain Prov. *espilori* and Fr. *pilori*, from *specula* through *specularium*.

Sentinelle, he thinks, first meant the beat or path of the guard, being a double diminutive from O. Fr. *sente*, a path. A passage cited by Littré seems to give it this fundamental meaning: "qui se fasche quand on l'appelle à la *sentinelle*," etc. Also *lever* or *relever de sentinelle* may mean to relieve by taking from the beat. This derivation would explain the feminine gender of the word. He connects *sombrer* with O. N. *sumbla*, to overwhelm, Eng. to *swamp*, and Sw. dialect *sumppa*, to drown.

SAMUEL GARNER.

LIST OF PERIODICALS.

Among the serial publications on philology already at the command of this Journal are the following:

- 'Αθήναιον. Athens.
- Alemannia. Bonn.
- Anglia. Halle.
- Archaeologische Zeitung. Berlin.
- Archiv für das Studium der neuer. Sprachen und Lit. Braunschweig.
- Archiv für Literaturgeschichte. Leipzig.
- Ballad Society Publications.
- Beiträge zur gesch. d. deutschen Spr. und Lit. Halle.
- Beiträge zur Kunde der indoger. Sprachen. (Bezzenberger.) Göttingen.
- Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung. (Kuhn.) Berlin.
- Berlin. Königliche Akad. der Wissensch.
- Philologische und historische Abhandlungen.
- Bollettino italiano degli studii orientali. Firenze.
- Bollettino archeologico. Firenze.
- Chaucer Society Publications.
- Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft: Abhandlungen. Leipzig.
Zeitschrift. Leipzig.
- Early English Text Society Publications. London.
- English Dialect Society Publications. London.
- Englische Studien. (Kölbing.) Heilbronn.
- Germania. (Bartsch.) Wien.
- Giornale di filologia romanza. Roma.
- Göttingische gelehrte. Anzeigen.
- Hermes. Berlin.
- Indian Antiquary.
- Indische Studien. (Weber.) Berlin.
- Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft. Leipzig.
- Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. (Fleckisen.) Leipzig.
- Jahresber. ü. d. Fortsch. d. class. Alterthumswiss. (Bursian.) Berlin.
- Journal asiatique. Paris.
- Journal of Philology. London.
- Journal of the American Oriental Society. New Haven.
- Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. London.
- Leipziger Studien.
- Mnemosyne. Lugduni Batavorum et Lipsiae.
- Munich. Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften;
Abhandlungen der philosoph. philolog. Classe.
- Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie. Leipzig.
- New Shakspere Society Publications.

Palaeographical Society Publications.
Paris: Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres. Comptes rendus. Mémoires.
Παρνασσός. Athens.
Philological Society: Proceedings. London.
Transactions. London.
Philologischer Anzeiger. Göttingen.
Philologus. Göttingen.
Revue critique. Paris.
Revue de linguistique et de philologie comparée. Paris.
Revue historique de l'ancienne langue française. (Favre.)
Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Frankfurt.
Rivista di filologia. Torino.
Romania. Paris.
Romanische Studien. London and Strassburg.
Spenser Society Publications.
St. Petersburg. Académie impériale des sciences:
 Bulletin de la classe historico-philolog.
 Mélanges gréco-romains.
 Mémoires: Sciences polit. hist. et philol.
Trübner's American and oriental literary record. London.
Vienna. K. K. Akademie der Wissenschaften:
 Denkschriften u. Sitzungsberichte. Philos. histor. classe.
Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Leipzig.
Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie. Halle.
Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum. (Müllenhoff u. Steinmeyer.) Berlin.
Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie. Halle.
Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien. Wien.
Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. (Kuhn.) Berlin.
Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft. Berlin.

While it will not be practicable to report on all these publications at length, abstracts of some and notes on others will appear in each issue of the Journal. Some of the most important for our purposes are already provided for, but help is needed in this direction. Rev. Dr. C. H. Toy of New York has kindly undertaken a portion of the Oriental work, and the postponement of his reports is due to the delay in procuring a good font of types for transliteration.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

AMERICAN.

Clough (J. W.), *A Study of the Hexameter of Virgil.* pp. 34. Boston. 35 cts.
Clough (J. W.), *A Study of the principal Latin Rhythms other than the Hexameter.* pp. 56. Boston. 35 cts.

Goodwin (W. W.), *Elementary Greek Grammar.* Second ed. pp. xxx—393.
Ginn & Heath. Boston. \$1.70.

Hewett (W. T.) *Frisian Language and Literature: A Historical Study.* 12mo, sd., pp. 60. Ithaca, New York. 75 cts.

Lewis (Charlton T.) and Short (Charles), *A Latin Dictionary, founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary.* Revised and enlarged, and in great part re-written. Roy. 8vo, pp. 2020. *Harpers.* \$8.50.

Symonds (J. Addington), *Studies of the Greek Poets.* American ed. (revised, re-arranged and enlarged). 2 v. 488; pp. 419. *Harpers.* \$3.50.

Taylor (Bayard), *Studies in German Literature.* With an introduction by George H. Boker. Post 8vo, pp. 418. *Low.* New York. \$2.25.

Webb (A. C.), *Manual of Etymology.* 12mo, pp. 320. Philadelphia. \$1.25.

Whiting (Jas. H.), *Catalogue of Spanish Library and of Portuguese Books bequeathed by G. Ticknor to the Boston Public Library.* Roy. 8vo, pp. xvi—476. Boston.

Whitney (William Dwight), *A Sanskrit Grammar, including both the Classical Language and the Older Dialects of Veda and Brahmana.* 8vo, pp. 500. *B. Westermann & Co.* New York. \$3.70.

Year-Book of Education for 1879. Second Annual Supplement to the Cyclo-pedia of Education. 4to, pp. vi—566. New York. \$2.00.

BRITISH.

The following books are published in London unless otherwise indicated.

Aristophanes, *Scenes from. The Frogs.* Edited by A. Sidgwick. New ed. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 64. *Rivingtons.* 1s. 6d.

Bell (A. M.), *Second Greek Reader.* Selections from Herodotus and Xenophon. 12mo, pp. 340. *Macmillan.* 3s. 6d.

Caesar de Bello Gallico. Books 1, 2, 3. Edited by J. H. Merryweather, M. A., and C. C. Tancock, A. M. Sm. 8vo, pp. 234. *Rivingtons.* 3s. 6d.

Caesar. *Fifteen Maps to Illustrate Caesar's Gallic War.* By A. Von Kampen. Letter-press by J. S. Stallybrass. Roy. 4to. *Sonnenschein & Allen.* 6s.

Catullus. *Selected Poems.* With Notes by Prof. H. A. Strong, Melbourne University. Cr. 8vo. *James Maclehose (Glasgow).* *G. Robertson (Melbourne).* 5s.

Chronology (The) of Ancient Nations. Translated and Edited by Dr. C. E. Lachlan. Roy. 8vo. *W. H. Allen.* 42s.

Church (Rev. Alfred), Stories from the Greek Tragedians. With twenty-four Illustrations. Post 8vo, pp. 260. *Seeley*. 5s.

Cicero. Cato Major, de Senectute. Edited by James S. Reid. 12mo, pp. 190. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 3s. 6d.

Coins. Catalogue of the Collection of Greek and Roman Coins formed by George Sim. 4to. *Macmillan*. 21s.

Corner (Miss), History of Greece. New ed. 8vo, pp. 224. *Dean*. 3s.

Duncker (Max), The History of Antiquity. From the German. By Evelyn Abbott. Vol. 3. 8vo, pp. 460. *Bentley*. 21s.

Euripides Alcestis. With English Notes, etc. By John Milner. New ed. 12mo, pp. 96. *Crosby Lockwood*. 1s. 6d.

Grimm (Jacob), Teutonic Mythology. Translated by J. S. Stallybrass. Vol. 1. 8vo, pp. 8—437. *Sonnenschein*. 15s.

Guillemand (W. H.), Hebraisms in the Greek Testament. 8vo, pp. 90. *Bell & Sons*. 8s. 6d.

Horace's Odes. Book 4. With English Notes and Introduction by J. M. Marshall. Catena Classicorum. Cr. 8vo, pp. 72. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Kennedy (Benjamin Hall), The Public School Latin Grammar. Fifth ed. Post 8vo, pp. 650. *Longmans*. 7s. 6d.

Lane (Edward William), Selections from the Koran. New ed. By Stanley Lane Poole. (Trübner's Oriental Series, Vol. 7.) 8vo, pp. 280. *Trübner*. 9s.

Livy. By W. W. Capes. (Classical Writers.) 18mo, pp. 116. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Lucian. Select Dialogues. With English Notes, by Henry Young. New ed. 12mo. *Crosby Lockwood*. 1s. 6d.

Martin (A.), The School Latin Grammar. 12mo. *Longmans*. 2s.

Mayor (J. B.), Guide to the Choice of Classical Books. Second ed. Post 8vo, pp. 94. *Bell & Sons*. 3s.

Morice (Rev. F. D.), Stories in Attic Greek. Second ed. Cr. 8vo, pp. 192. *Rivingtons*. 3s. 6d.

Psalms (The) in Hebrew, without Points. Post 8vo. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

Sallust's Jugurthine War. Edited by Alfred Milnes and A. R. Cluer. 12mo, pp. x—170. *Hirst Smyth*. 3s.

Sayce (Rev. A. H.), Babylonian Literature. Lectures Delivered at the Royal Institution. 8vo, pp. 84. *Bagster*. 4s.

Skeat (W. W.), An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, arranged on an Historical Basis. Part 2. 4to, sd. *Macmillan*. 10s. 6d.

Sophocles. By Lewis Campbell. 12mo, pp. 152. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Terence. Phormio. A Revised Text, with Notes, and an Introduction, by Rev. J. Bond and A. Sumner Walpole. 18mo, pp. 186. *Macmillan*. 4s. 6d.

Vincent (E.) and Dickson (T. G.), A Hand-book to Modern Greek. With Preface by J. S. Blackie. 12mo, pp. 282. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Virgil. By H. Nettleship. (Classical Writers.) 18mo, pp. 108. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Wilson (J. C.), Aristotelian Studies. 1. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. Chapters 1—10. 8vo, sd. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Xenophon's Anabasis. Book 2, with English Notes. By Alfred Pretor. 12mo, pp. 88. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s. 6d.

Xenophon's Anabasis of Cyrus. Book 1. By R. W. Taylor. Post 8vo, pp. 166. *Rivingtons.* 2s. 6d.

Xenophon's Anabasis of Cyrus. Book 2. By R. W. Taylor. Post 8vo, pp. 190. *Rivingtons.* 2s.

FRENCH.

The following books are published in Paris unless otherwise indicated.

Benloew (Louis), Analyse de la langue albanaise. Étude de grammaire comparée. In-8. *Maison neuve.* 6 fr.

Bonnemère (Lionel), Voyages à travers les Gaules cinquante-six ans avant Jésus Christ. In-12. *Dentu.* 3 fr. 50.

Caillemer (E.), Le Droit de succession légitime à Athènes. In-8. (Caen.) *Thonin.* 8 fr.

Caspari (C. P.), Grammaire arabe. Traduite de la 4^e édition allemande, et en partie remaniée par E. Uricochea. 1^{er} fascicule. In-8. (Bruxelles.) *Chez le traducteur, 196 rue du Faub.-St-Honoré.* Prix de l'ouvrage complet, 20 fr.

Demosthène. Les Plaidoyers politiques de Demosthène, traduits en français, avec arguments et notes par Rod. Darest. 2 vol. in-12. *Plon.* 8 fr.

Dreyfous-Brisac (Edmond), L'Université de Bonn et l'enseignement supérieur en Allemagne. In-8. *Hachette.* 5 fr.

Du Cange. Glossaire français faisant suite au *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis.* Avec additions et une notice sur Du Cange par L. Favre. Tome I (A-F.). In-8. (Niort.) *Champion.* 10 fr.

Frehner (W.), Terres cuites d'Asie-Mineure. Livraisons 1 et 2. In-4 avec gravures. *Chez M. Hoffman, 33 quai Voltaire.* Chaque livraison, 7 fr. 50. L'ouvrage formera 10 livraisons.

Girard (Jules), Le Sentiment religieux en Grèce d'Homère à Eschyle. 2^e édition. In-12. *Hachette.* 3 fr. 50.

Maspero (G.), Études égyptiennes. Romans et poésies du papyrus Harris. n° 500. In-8, avec fac-simile. *Maison neuve.* 15 fr. Extrait du Journal asiatique.

Matinée (A.), Platon et Plotin. Étude sur deux théories philosophiques. In-12. *Hachette.* 2 fr.

Mohl (Jules), Vingt-sept ans des études orientales. Rapports faits à la Société asiatique de Paris de 1840 à 1867. Tome I. In-8 *Reinwald.* 7 fr. 50.

Pierret (Paul), Essai sur la mythologie égyptienne. In-8. (Autographié.) *Vieweg.* 7 fr. 50.

Pietrement (C. A.), Les Aryas et leur première patrie. In-8. *Maison neuve.* 2 fr. 50.

Platon. L'Etat ou la République de Platon. Traduction nouvelle par A. Bastien. In-12. *Garnier.* 3 fr.

Reynaud (Paul), La Langue et la littérature sanscrites. Discours d'ouverture des conférences de sanscrit. In-18. *Leroux.* 1 fr.

Riemann (Othon), Recherches archéologiques sur les îles Ioniennes. II. Céphalonie. In-8. *Thorin.* 3 fr.

Rougé. Inscriptions et notices recueillies à Edsou (Haute-Égypte). Tome I. In-4. *Leroux.* 30 fr.

Simond (Joseph), L'Education et l'instruction des enfants chez les anciens Juifs. In-8. (Nîmes.) *Fischbacher.* 2 fr.

Wallon (H.), *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*. 2^e édition. Tomes I, II, III. In-8. *Hachette*. 22 fr. 50.

Vayssier (feu l'abbé), *Dictionnaire patois- français du département de l'Aveyron*. In-8. (Rodez.) *Champion*. 12 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen f. die Kunde d. Morgenlandes. 7. Bd. Nr. 2. gr. 8. Leipzig. n. 4. Inhalt: *De la métrique chez les Syriens*: Par l'abbé Martin. (71 S.)

Anderson, Nicolai, *Studien zur Vergleichung der indogermanischen u. finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen*. gr. 8. (322 S.) Dorpat. Leipzig, *K. F. Koehler*. n. 6.

Baragiola, Dr. Aristide, *italienische Grammatik m. Berücksicht. d. Lateinischen u. der romanischen Schwester sprachen*. gr. 8. (XVII 240 S.) Strassburg, 1880, *Trübner*. n. 5.

Bartholomae, Chrn., die *Gāvā*'s u. heiligen Gebete d. altiranischen Volkes. [Metrum, Text, Grammatik u. Wortverzeichniss.] gr. 8. (172 S.) Halle, *Niemeyer*. n. 5.

Bayle, Prof. Abbé A., *anthologie provençale*. Avec une notice sur l'auteur par J. B. Sardou. 8. (XV 282 S.) Aix. Leipzig, *Harrassowitz in Comm.* baar n. 3.

Becker, Heinr., *studia Apuleiana*. gr. (92 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 3.

Behncke, G., *de Cicerone Epicureorum philosophiae existimatore et judice*. 4. (24 S.) Berlin, *Weber*. n. 1.

Bender, Prof. Herm., *Rom u. römisches Leben im Alterthum*. Mit zahlreichen Abbildgn. 1. Halbbd. Lex.-8. (VIII 272 S.) Tübingen. n. 6.

Benfey, Thdr., *die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Samhitā- u. Pada-Texten der Veden*. 4. Abhandl. (à 41 S.) Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 5.

Bertonio, P. Ludovico, *arte de la lengua Aymara*. Ed. facsimilaria. gr. 8. (349 S.) Leipzig, *Trübner*. n. 16.

Bibliotheca normannica. Halle, *Niemeyer*. n. 8. 50. Inhalt: 1. Reimpredigt, hrsg. v. Herm. Suchier. (LVI 110 S.) n. 4. 50. 2. *Der Judenknabe*. 5 griech., 14 latein. u. 8 französ. Texte, hrsg. v. Aug. Wolter. (128 S.) n. 4.

Bibliotheca philologica. Hrsg. v. Dr. W. Müldener. 32. Jahr. 1. Hft. Jan. Juni 1879. gr. 8. (133 S.) New York, *B. Westermann & Co.* n. 1. 20.

Bibliothek, altfranzösische. Hrsg. v. W. Foerster. 2. Bd. 8. Heilbronn, 1880, *Henniger*. Inhalt: Karls d. Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem u. Constantinopel. n. 2. 80 (1. u. 2.: n. 9. 60. Ein altfranzös. Gedicht d. XI. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Ed. Koschwitz. (113 S.)

Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Litteratur-Denkäler. 3. Bd. Angelsächsische Denkmäler. 1. Teil. gr. 8. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. n. 5. Inhalt: Beowulf. Mit ausführl. Glossar hrsg. v. Mor. Heyne. 4. Aufl. (VIII 287 S.)

Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken. 2. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*. Inhalt: Indische grammatic, umfassend die klassische Sprache u. die älteren Dialekte, v. Will. Dwight Whitney. Aus dem Engl. übers. v. Heinr. Zimmer. (XXVIII 519 S.) n. 10.

Böhtlingk, Otto, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*. 1. Thl. Die *Vocale*. Imp.-4. VI 299 S.) St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss*. n. 11. 70.

Bröcker, Dr. L. D., *Untersuchungen üb. Diodor*. 8. (68 S.) Gütersloh. n. 1. 20.

Brugsch Bey, Henry, *Dictionnaire géographique de l'ancienne Egypte*. 14—17, livr. Fol. (XVI. u. S. 1053—1420.) Leipzig, 1880. baar n. 112.

Buchholtz, Herm., oskisches Perfectum in lateinischer Inschrift. gr. 8. (7 S.) Berlin, 1878, *Dümmler's Verl.* baar n. 20.

Crestien v. Troies, li romans dou Chevalier au Lyon. Hrsg. v. W. L. Holland. 1. Aufl. gr. 8. (X 262 S.) Hannover, 1880, *Rümpler.* n. 5.

Ciceronis, M. Tullii, scripta, quae manserunt omnia. Recogn. C. F. W. Mueller. Partis IV, vol. III. 8. (LXI 444 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner.* 2. 10. (IV 2. u. 3. : 4. 20.)

Ciceronis orationes selectae XIX. In usum scholarum edd., indices et memorabilia vitae Ciceronis adiecerunt A. Eberhard et W. Hirschfelder. Ed. II 8. (XIX 690 S.) Ebd. n. 2.

Ciceros 4. Rede gegen Verres. Nach e. Heft v. Lehrs übers. v. Dr. Otto Pfundtner. (VI 96 S.) Königsberg, 1880, *Hartung.* n. 1. 50.

Danker, Otto, die Laut- u. Flexionslehre der mittelkentischen Denkmäler, nebst roman. Wortverzeichniss. Diss. gr. 8. (III 63 S.) Strassburg, *Trübner.* n. 1. 60.

Delbrück, B., syntaktische Forschungen. 4. Bd. A. u. d. T.: Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax erörtert. gr. 8. (VIII 155 S.) Halle. n. 3. 60 (1—4. : n. 13. 90).

Doornkaat-Koolman, J. ten, Wörterbuch der ostfriesischen Sprache. 9. Hft. gr. 8. (2 Bd. S. 1—144.) Norden, *Braams.* (a) n. 2.

Doxographi graeci. Collegit, recensuit, etc., Herm. Diels. Opus Academ. litt. regiae Borussicae praemio ornatum. gr. 8. (X 854 S.) Berlin. n. 24.

Duncker, Max, Geschichte d. Alterthums. 3. Bd. 5 verb. Aufl. gr. 8. (VIII 428 S.) Leipzig. *Duncker & Humblot.* n. 8.

Euripides, Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. N. Wecklein. 3. Bdchn.: Bachtchen. gr. 8. (VI 111 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner.* 1. 50.

Falke, Jak. v., Hellas u. Rom. 8—16. Lfg. Fol. Stuttgart, *Spemann.* 1. 50.

Faulmann, Prof. Karl, illustrierte Geschichte der Schrift. 12—15. Lfg. gr. 8. (S. 353—480.) Wien, *Hartleben.* à n. 60.

Forcellini, Aegid., totius latinitatis lexicon, cura et studio Vinc. De-Vit. Distr. 66. (Finis.) Prati. (Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort.*) n. 3. 40 (cpl.: n. 165. 90.)

Foy, Dr. Karl, Lautsystem der griechischen Vulgärsprache. gr. 8. (VIII 146 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner.* n. 3.

Freund, Wilk., Triennium philologicum. 1. Sem.-Abth. 1. Hft. 2. verb. Aufl. gr. 8. (80 S.) Leipzig, *Violet.* n. 1.

Furkheim, Federigo, bibliotheca Pompejana. gr. 8. (VII 37 S.) Neapel, *Furkheim.* n. 3.

Galen libellum *πεπὶ ἐθῶν*, rec. Iwanus Mueller. gr. 4. (19 S.) Erlangen *Diechert.* n. 60.

Gebhardi, Oberlehr. Dr. Walth., kritisch-exegetische Studien zum 2. Teil v. Vergils Aeneis. 4. (24 S.) Meseritz, *Kunstmüller.* n. 1.

Goebel, Dr. Carol., de conjunctione Quom. 8. (VI 30 S.) Gütersloh, *Bertelsmann.* n. 80.

Goszrau, G. W., lateinische Sprachlehre. 2., verb. Aufl. gr. 8. (XII 747 S.) Quedlinburg, 1880, *Baffe.* n. 7.

Grimm, Jac., kleinere Schriften. 1. Bd. A. u. d. T.: Reden u. Abhandlungen. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. (VII 415 S.) Berlin, *Dümmers' Verl.* n. 9.

Gropp, Ernst, on the language of the proverbs of Alfred. Diss. gr. 8. (71 S.) Halis Sax. Berlin, *Anders & Busleb.* baar n. 1.

Helm, F., *quaestiones syntacticae de participiorum usu Tacitino, Velleiano, Sallustiano*, gr. 8. (IV 139 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 3.

Homers Ilias. Erklärt v. Dir. J. La Roche. Ges. XVII—XX. (413 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1. 50.

Homer's Odyssee. Erklärt v. Dr. K. F. Ameis. 1. Bd. 1. Hft. Gesang I—VI 7. bericht. Aufl. (C. Hentze.) gr. 8. (XXIV 188 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1. 35.

Homer's dasselbe Anhang. 1. Hft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang I—VI. 3. umgearb. Aufl. (C. Hentze.) gr. 8. (145 S.) Ebd. 1. 50.

Hommel, Fritz, zwei Jagdinschriften Asurbanibal's. gr. 8. (VIII 63 S.) Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 5. 60.

Horatii Flacci, Q., *carmina. Iterum recogn.* Lucianus Mueller. 8. (LXXVIII 295 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 1.

Hygini Gromatici liber de munitionibus castrorum, ex recensione Guil. Gemoll. 8. (50 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. 75.

Isocratis orationes. Recognovit, etc. Gust. Ed. Benseler. Ed. II. curante Frdr. Blass. Vol. II. 8. (LX 324 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1. 35.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft hrsg. v. Prof. Conr. Bursian. 7. Jahr. 1879. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. baar n. 30.

Keller, Otto, *Epilegomena zu Horaz*. 1. Thl. gr. 8. (XII 290 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 8.

Kirchhoff, A., die homerische Odyssee. gr. 8. (XII 599 S.) Berlin, *Hertz*. n. 12.

Kühner, Dr. Raph., *ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 2. Bd. 2. Abth. gr. 8. (XII u. S. 629—1166.) Hannover, *Hahn*. n. 7. — (epl.: n. 25.) Lagarde, Paul de, *Semitica*. 2. Hft. gr. 4. (48 S.) Göttingen. n. 2. 40 (1. u. 2.: n. 5. 40.)

Lange, Prof. Dr. Ludw., *römische Alterthümer*. 2. Bd. Die Staatsalterthümer. 2. Thl. 3. Aufl. gr. 8. (XII 778 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*.

Lange, de magistratum Romanorum renuntiatione et de centuriatorum comitiorum forma recentiore. gr. 4. (31 S.) Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Sort.* baar n. 1. 60.

Lange, de L. Marcii Philippi orationis apud Sallustium loco. gr. 4. (15 S.) Ebd. barr n. — 80.

Lange über das Verhältniss d. Studiums der classischen Philologie auf der Universität zu dem Berufe der Gymnasiallehrer. (21 S.) Ebd. baar n. 1.

Lange, Dr. Rud., das Taketori Monogatari od. das Mädchen aus dem Monde. Aus dem Japan. gr. 8. (37 S.) Yokohama and Berlin, *Asher & Co.* 4.

Lauth, Prof. Dr. F. J., aus Aegyptens Vorzeit. 1. Hft. Die prähistor. Zeit, gr. 8. (100 S.) Berlin, *Zh. Hofmann*. n. 2.

Livi, T., ab urbe condita libri a XXVI ad XXX. Rec. Aug. Luchs. gr. 8. (CLII 393 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 11.

Marquardt u. Mommsen, Handb. der röm. Alterthümer. 7. Bd. Das Privatleben der Römer v. Joach. Marquardt. 1. Thi. gr. 8. (XII 372 S.) Leipzig, *Hirzel*. n. 8.

Mau, Aug., pompejanische Beiträge. Mit. 3. Taf. gr. 8. (VIII 261 S.) Berlin, *G. Reimer*. n. 6.

Mekler, Siegfr., Euripidea. Textkritische Studien. gr. 8. (71 S.) Wien, *Konig*. n. 2.

Meltzer, Otto, Geschichte der Karthager. 1. Bd. gr. 8. (XII 530 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 10.

Merguet, H., Lexicon zu den Reden d. Cicero. 2. Bd. 8. u. 9. Lfg. hoch 4. (S. 265—336.) Jena, *Fischer*. á n. 2.

Meyer, Leo, griechische Aoriste. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. Tempus- u. Modusgebrauchs im Gr. gr. 8. (189 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 4.

Müller, der indogermanische Sprachbau in seiner Entwicklung. 1. Thl. gr 8. (X 450 S.) Göttingen, *Vandenhoek & Ruprecht's Verl.* n. 9.

Nadrowski, Rich., neue Schlaglichter auf dunkeln Gebieten der griechischen u. lateinischen Etymologie. gr. 8. (56 S.) Berlin, *Burmester & Stempel*. n. 1. 20.

Nöldeke, Th., die Erzählung vom Mäusekönig u. seinen Ministern. gr. 4. (68 S.) Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 3. 50.

Ovidii Nasonis, P., fastorum libri VI. Für die Schule erklärt v. H. Peter. 2. verb. Aufl. gr. 8. *Teubner*. 3. 60.

Pauli, Rect. Dr. Carl, etruskische Studien. 1. Hft. (111 S.) Göttingen, *Vandenhoek & Ruprecht's Verl.* n. 2. 40.

Pischel, Rich., the Assalayanasuttam. Ed. and translated. gr. 8. (42 S.) Chemnitz, 1880. *Schmeitzner*. n. 2. 25.

Plauti, T. Macci, comoediae. Rec., etc. F. Ritschelius. Tomi I Fasc. 3. Curcio, rec. Geo. Goetz. gr. 8. (XXIV 86 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 2. 40.

Plutarch, ausgewählte Biographien. 2. Bdchn.: Timoleon u. Pyrrhos. Von O. Sieffert. 2. Aufl., besorgt v. Frdr. Blass. gr. 8. (IV 143 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. I. 50.

Poema del Cid. neu hrsg. v. Karl Vollmöller. 1. Thi.: Text. gr. 8. (95 S.) Halle, *Niemeyer*. n. 2. 80.

Praetorius, Frz., die amharische Sprache. 2. [Schluss-] Hft. gr. 4. (XIII u. S. 277—523.) Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenh.* (á n. 15.

Râvanavaha od. Setubandha. hrsg. v. Siegfr. Goldschmidt. Mit e. Wortindex. 1. Lfg.: Text, Index. gr. 4. (XXIII 194 S.) Strassburg, 1880, *Trübner*. n. n. 25.

Rein, Dr. Carl, de pronominum apud Terentium collocatione capita IV. gr. 8. (66 S.) Leipzig, *Stauffer*. n. 1.

Revillout, Eug., nouvelle chrestomathie démotique, mission de 1878. gr. 4. (XII 160.) Paris, 1878. baar n. 20.

Ribbeck, W., homerische Formenlehre. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. (VI 89 S.) Berlin, 1880, *Calvary & Co.* n. 1. 50.

Ritschl's, Frdr. Opuscula philologica. Vol. V.: Varia. gr. 8. (XII 772 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 18. — (cpl.: n. 98. 80.)

Roemer, Adph., die exegetischen Scholien der Ilias im Codex Ven. gr. 8. (XVIII 117 S.) München, *Lindauer*. n. 4.

Schiller, K., u. A. Lübben, mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch. 26. u. 27. Hft. gr. 8. (5. Bd. S. 465—720.) Bremen, *Küthmann & Co.* á n. 2. 50.

Schlee, Frdr., de versuum in canticis Terentianis consecutione. Diss. gr. 8. (74 S.) Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 1. 60.

Schi-king. Das kanonische Liederbuch der Chinesen. Aus dem Chines. übers. u. erklärt von Vict. v. Strauss. gr. 8. (528 S.) Heidelberg, 1880, *G. Winter*. n. 17. —: geb. n. 20.

Schmidt, Bernh., die Thorfrage in der Topographie Athens. 4. (44 S.) Freiburg i. Br. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 2.

Schreiber, Thdr., Apollon Pythoktonos. Mit 2 Taf. gr. 8. (106 S.) Leipzig, *Engelmann*. n. 4.

Sophoclis tragoeiae, ex rec. et cum praef. G. Dindorfii. Ed. V. correctior. 8 (LXIX 381 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. I. 50.

Sophoclis ausgew. Tragödien, zum Schulgeb. v. N. Wecklein. 4. Bdchn. Aias. gr. 8. (98 S.) München, *Lindauer*. (à) n. I. 25.

Stade, Prof. Dr. Bernh., Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik. I. Thl. gr. 8. (XIII 425 S.) Leipzig, *F. C. W. Vogel*. n. 9.

Strümpell, Prof. Ludw., psychologische Pädagogik. gr. 8. (VIII 368 S.) Leipzig, 1880, *Böhme*. n. 5. 40.

Struve, Otto, de compositi operis Thucydidii temporibus. gr. 8. (40 S.) Halis Sax. 1878. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. I.

Stürzinger, Jak., üb. die Conjugation im Rätoromanischen. gr. 8. (64 S.) Winterthur, *Heilbronn, Henninger*. baar n. I. 80.

Tabari, Geschichte der Perser u. Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden. Aus der arab. Chronik übers. v. Th. Nöldeke. gr. 8. (XXVIII 503 S.) Leiden, *Brill*. n. n. 12.

Weber, Albr., indische Streifen. 3. Bd. Mit Register f. alle 3 Bde. gr. 8. (XVI 645 S.) Leipzig, *Brockhaus*. n. 20. — (I—3: n. 25.

Wenzel, Dr. Heinr., üb. den Instrumentalis im Rigveda. gr. 8. (VII 110 S.) Tübingen, *Laupp*. n. 4.

Wildauer, Dr. Tob., Platons lehre vom Willen. gr. 8. (VIII 243 S.) Innsbruck, *Wagner*. n. 6.

Wille, üb. $\delta\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ καὶ φόβος in Aristoteles' Poetik. gr. 8. (16 S.) Berlin, *Weber*. n. — 80.

Wohlrab, Mart., vier gemeinverständl. Vorträge üb. Platons Lehrer u. Lehren. 8. (IV 87 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. I. 60.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., for material furnished.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Whitney (W. D.), A Sanskrit Grammar, including both the Classical Language, with the Older Dialects of Veda and Brahmana. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*. New York, *B. Westermann & Co.*, 838 Broadway. xx—485. \$3.70.

Skeat (W. W.), An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, arranged on an Historical Basis. By the Rev. W. W. Skeat, M. A., Prof. of Anglo-Saxon at Cambridge. London, *Macmillan & Co.* Part II. Dor—Lit. 4to. \$2.50.

Goodwin (Alfred), The Cyropaedia of Xenophon. Books VII and VIII. London, *Macmillan & Co.* xiv—167.

Vincent (E.), and Dickson (J. G.), A Hand-book to Modern Greek; A Grammar, Dialogues, etc. London, *Macmillan & Co.* 16mo. \$1.25.

The last three through *Cushings & Bailey*, Baltimore.

During the absence of the editor, who has gone to Europe for several months, the editorial department will be in the hands of Professor Charles D. Morris, of the Johns Hopkins University; and the business of the Baltimore office will be conducted by Dr. William Hand Browne, Librarian of the Johns Hopkins University, to whom all letters should be addressed.